

Paul RASSINIER

Debunking the Genocide Myth

**A Study of the Nazi Concentration Camps and the Alleged
Extermination of European Jewry**

Introduction by Pierre Hofstetter

Translated from the French by Adam Robbins

© The Noontide Press Los Angeles, California

AAARGH

This text is the "Introduction" to *Debunking the Genocide Myth, a Study of the Nazi Concentration Camps and the Alleged Extermination of European Jewry*, by Paul RASSINIER, Introduction by Pierre Hofstetter, Translated from the French by Adam Robbins, published in 1978 in Los Angeles by The Noontide Press, PO Box 2719, Newport beach, CA 92659.

Library of Congress Catalog Card Number: 78-53090. ISBN 0-911038-24-8.
Copyright © 1978 by the Noontide Press.

This text has been displayed on the Net, and forwarded to you as a tool for educational purpose, further research, on a non commercial and fair use basis, by the International Secretariat of the Association des Anciens Amateurs de Récits de Guerres et d'Holocaustes (AAARGH). The E-mail of the Secretariat is <aaarghinternational@hotmail.com>. Mail can be sent at PO Box 81475, Chicago, IL 60681-0475, USA.

We see the act of displaying a written document on Internet as the equivalent to displaying it on the shelves of a public library. It costs us a modicum of labor and money. The only benefit accrues to the reader who, we surmise, thinks by himself. A reader looks for a document on the Web at his or her own risks. As for the author, there is no reason to suppose that he or she shares any responsibility for other writings displayed on this Site. Because laws enforcing a specific censorship on some historical question apply in various countries (Germany, France, Israel, Switzerland, Canada, and others) we do not ask their permission from authors living in those places: they wouldn't have the freedom to consent.

We believe we are protected by the Human Rights Charter:

ARTICLE 19. <Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers.>The Universal Declaration of Human Rights, adopted by the United Nations General Assembly on December 10, 1948, in Paris.

Table of Contents

About The Author	4
Introduction by PIERRE HOFSTETTER	5
Part I The Author's Experience	10
Chapter One Prologue	10
Chapter Two Swarms of Humanity at the Gates of Hell.....	23
Chapter Three The Circles of Hell	37
Chapter Four Charon's Bark	49
Chapter Five Port of Grace; Anteroom of Death	65
Chapter Six Shipwreck	76
PART II The Experience of Others.....	80
Chapter Seven Concentration Camp Literature	80
Chapter Eight The Minor Witnesses	90
Chapter Nine Louis Martin-Chauffier	99
Part III The Drama of European Jews	156
Chapter Twelve Raul Hilberg: His Doctrine and His Methods	156
Chapter Thirteen Witnesses, Testimonies, and Documents	167
Chapter Fourteen Statistics: Six Million or... ..	210
Chapter Fifteen Conclusion: Six Million Exterminated Jews -- Fact or Fiction ...	277
Annexes	288
Appendix A: Four Descriptions of Prison Life in French Penal Institutions	288
Appendix B: The Two French Versions of the Gerstein Document.....	293
Appendix C: The Wolfgang Grosch Statement and a Report of a Second Lieutenant to a Lieutenant.....	302
Afterword by Mark Weber of the Institute for Historical Review	306

About The Author

Paul Rassinier was born on March 18, 1906, in Beaumont, a small village near Montbéliard, the son of a farmer. He received his formal education in the schools of the area and passed the necessary examinations which allowed him to teach history and geography at the secondary school level and to use the title of "professor." He taught in the secondary school at Faubourg de Montbéliard where students were prepared to take the "brevet," an examination that is somewhat inferior to that examination which is taken by students in the lycées who desire to matriculate at the university. It was at this school that he was arrested by the Gestapo in October 1943.

Having joined the Socialist Party, SFIO, in 1934, Paul Rassinier became the head of that party in the Belfort area when the war broke out in 1939. Following the German occupation of France, he participated in the founding of the "Libre-Nord" organization which became involved in various forms of "passive resistance," including the smuggling of Jewish refugees over the Franco-Swiss border into Switzerland in cooperation with the Swiss Jewish Committee. Rassinier's activities eventually came to the attention of the German authorities who caused him to be arrested and to be deported to the concentration camp at Buchenwald. Later he was sent to the camp at Dora where he was incarcerated until the end of the war.

Upon his liberation in 1945, he returned to France where he was elected to the Assemblée Nationale as a Socialist deputy. He served for one year and then retired. He was awarded the highest decoration which the French government bestowed for service in the wartime resistance movement. Due to his frail health, a consequence of his two years of imprisonment at Buchenwald and Dora, he retired from teaching and received a small pension from the French government. He died on July 29, 1967, at his home in Asnières, near Paris. He is survived by his wife, Jeanette, and his only son, Jean-Paul, who is a practicing physician.

Introduction

by PIERRE HOFSTETTER

In every respect, Paul Rassinier was a remarkable man of his time -- out of the ordinary, we are tempted to write -- a man to whom can be immediately attributed these three essential qualities, all of which are rather rare today in a single person: courage, honesty and ability.

As a professor of history and geography, he could have had a brilliant and lucrative career in these disciplines if he had confined himself to the "official history" -- i.e. the "official false history that is taught *ad usum Delphini*" and of which Balzac spoke -- and if he had not opted for historical revisionism by beginning to study carefully the "hidden history" wherein lies the true causes of events, in short, of the "shameful history". He devoted the last twenty years of his life to the debunking of the historical orthodoxy that surrounds World War II produced a shelf full of books which culminated in the remarkable work, insufficiently known, entitled *Les Responsables de la Seconde Guerre mondiale* (1) which was published shortly before his death in July 1967.

Paul Rassinier also could have made a name for himself in politics if, when he was a socialist representative in 1946, he had submitted to the oppressive climate of that period in France and had accepted open collaboration with the Communist Party. But, he refused such collaboration, and that party did all that it could to defeat him in his bid for re-election. As a matter of fact, the Communists always did want Paul Rassinier's "hide" in both the literal as well as the figurative sense. A confirmed, total pacifist, Rassinier, in 1922 at the age of 16, under the influence of the anarchist Victor Serge, had been drawn into the Communist Party from which, having later gone to the opposition, he was quickly excluded. He joined the Socialist party in 1936, where he made himself known particularly in the pacifist wing that was opposed to the French policies that led to the 1939 war. Then, after France was occupied by the German army, he was one of the earliest resisters to this occupation and helped to found the "Libre-Nord" movement, but, unlike the murderous guerrilla bands and the "shadow assassins," he tried to inculcate into these Resistance movements "the idea of nonviolence and the principles of total pacifism." Such an attitude succeeded in getting him "condemned to death" by the Communist resistance (which had arrived on the scene late following the German attack on the U.S.S.R. in June 1941) and in putting him on the receiving end of the ritual "little warning coffin" effigy. It is bitter irony that this man -- deported to Buchenwald and to Dora, where he endured frightful suffering for nearly two years -- should later concede that he only escaped from the rain of Communist machine gun fire thanks to his arrest by the Gestapo on October 30, 1943, and his subsequent deportation to Germany.

Liberated in 1945, returned to France on a stretcher, and declared to be a severe invalid, Paul Rassinier could have, once again, had a lucrative and successful career in what was called "*résistantialisme*," that is to say, the shameless, continuous and highly advantageous exploitation -- "make room for us!" -- of the events of the "resistance," real or imaginary. However in Belfort, his native city, he began with a nearly naive honesty to proclaim vociferously that he had never met in the Resistance most of the men who were speaking in its name, which was in itself, already a bold step. But, he went even further and with the exceptional courage of an honest man who was sickened by the flood of lies that flowed before his eyes, he began to denounce exaggerations of every kind concerning German war crimes, while maintaining that there had been as many war crimes committed on the Allied side as on that of the Axis and that they were all of a similar horrible nature.

Indignant. Paul Rassinier was thoroughly indignant, this former deportee, about the whole avalanche of questionable and often fanciful literature about the German concentration camps that passed before him. In the preface of Rassinier's *Le Parlement aux mains des banques* (2), the dramatist and screenwriter Henri Jeanson described Paul Rassinier's indignation as follows:

I like Rassinier very much. I like him very much because, without losing his composure, without grandiloquence, quite simply Rassinier lived, in the word of Zola, "indignant." Indignant, but calm because he was sure of his facts. Indignant, but imperturbable. Indignant since the age of sixteen.

The indignation of Rassinier does not make itself known through spectacular temper tantrums. He does not at all become carried away and avoids all invective. From these traits stem his strength and perfect aim. He does not belong to that race of congestive polemicists who rid themselves in one article -- whew -- of their scrupulosity or their bad temper and who write like someone purging himself. Once the article has been published, he does not consider himself released from duty as concerns himself and does not move to another sort of exercise. No, he carries on with a good faith that no one dreams of reproaching him for, with the exception, of course, of these national organizations in which authentic resistance fighters and deportees innocently allow themselves to be duped by the profiteers of the crematoriums. And these profiteers do exist. They have always existed. No one is unaware that the ossuary of Verdun, for example, has become a circus attraction and an excellent business whose profits are all the greater since the merchandise is never replenished. It is always the same skeletons which are used. The remains are not a loss for everyone.

Indignant; Paul Rassinier began, then, almost immediately upon his return from Buchenwald, to do battle against the numerous concentration camp legends, as a free spirit and a scrupulous historian. There were then published in succession *Le Passage de la ligne* (3), an impartial and lucid account of his life as a deportee, *Le Mensonge d'Ulysse* (4), a critical look at the orthodox concentration camp "literature," and *Ulysse trahi par les siens* (5), a companion work to *Le Mensonge d'Ulysse*. The bulk of these three works makes up the first eleven chapters of this present edition; some redundant material i.e., overlapping material which appears more than once in the original French editions -- has been removed from the present English language

editions which combines the three books, in an effort to retain the readability of the original works and to reduce the production costs of this edition. Naturally, the scope and the meaning of the original editions have not been altered by this editing.

On the subject of atrocity propaganda, Paul Rassinier, as the reader will discover when he reads the chapters which follow minces no words:

The atrocities and those responsible for them are clearly inseparable. Moreover, I shall perhaps astonish you. I forego, as a matter of fact, either giving you a list of these atrocities or decrying them to you. You have already heard far too much on the subject. The atrocity proves nothing, moreover, in history, either against he who commits it or in favor of he who is subjected to it. We have all too many examples of a world where today's victim is tomorrow's executioner and vice versa. It will be enough then for me to tell you that the concentration camps were a world of horrors. And if anything ought to be added, it would be this: in spite of this, just about all those who have spoken of them have overdone it and particularly their explanations have little in common with the truth Concerning figures, the "witnesses" have said and written the most improbable things. Concerning the implementation of the means of killing, also. Concentration camp literature on the whole has the appearance of a collection of contradictory pieces of ill-natured gossip.

With such a view on the worth of concentration camp literature, it is no surprise that Paul Rassinier began to question the central tenet of the concentration camp orthodoxy, to wit: the claim of Jewish genocide. On this subject, the authoritative work of Paul Rassinier clearly remains his *Le Drame des Juifs européens* (6) in which he examined, with the care of the scrupulous historian that we know him to be, the documents, the statistics, and the census figures that are related to the alleged holocaust. The translation of this study is found in the final four chapters of this volume. Without question, it is an authoritative work in its genre. And, as such, it has been circulated widely through Europe during the past decade. Moreover, *Le Drame* - as well as Rassinier's numerous other works -- has inspired an ever-growing library of other "revisionist" works on the subject, including the excellent study by Arthur R. Butz, *The Hoax of the Twentieth Century*. (7)

Paul Rassinier's contentions that there was no Nazi policy of Jewish genocide, that there were no officially sanctioned "exterminations by gas" and that there were no six million Jewish deaths at the hands of the Nazis have, naturally, bothered greatly the "court historians," caught with their hands in the cookie jar, so to speak, with their dishonest scholarship, as well as the entire Zionist establishment which has built the State of Israel on the "myth of the six million." In fact, the post-war politics of the Soviet Union, of the Bonn government in West Germany, and of the United States with regard to its "Cold War" policies have been justified, to a large extent, by the pointing to the alleged Nazi wartime atrocities, with the expressed hope that the given policy under consideration will prevent what the Nazis "did" from ever occurring again, et caetera, ad nauseam. Thus, it should be no secret why historical revisionism in this area of study has been greeted with such hostility from "official quarters" on both sides of the "Iron Curtain."

Notwithstanding his iconoclastic contentions, Paul Rassinier kept things in balance. In the chapter concerning the "Jewish question" in his *Les Responsables de la seconde guerre mondiale*, he argued that "... even stripped of all the exaggerations that have falsified its meaning" Hitler's policy against the Jews was an unquestionable attack on human rights and was, according to the sanctioned expression 'more than a crime, a transgression'. But, he hastens to add that to a certain extent the misfortunes of the Jews during that period were a consequence of their own doing:

Let us recognize that [the Jewish] claim to wanting to be in Germany -- as in every other country that they regard as a "land of welcome" -- a national minority was scarcely tenable either. It was up to themselves to admit that they were foreigners in Germany and to surrender any right to protest if, in his turn, Hitler treated them like foreigners. The other governments of the world were free to accept this claim of the Jews, it was a problem of domestic policy which was none of Hitler's affair. Let the Jews of Germany go settle elsewhere, he said. The Third Reich was a totalitarian state, and, in its bosom, there was no room for a national minority.

The only problem with Hitler's plan was that the other sovereign states wanted nothing to do with these Jews, at least in appreciable numbers. "Even had they wanted to deal with them, Hitler's policy would have remained, without any doubt a blow to human rights," Rassinier remarked further, "but it would have remained such only from the point of view of principles and, on the practical level, it would have not taken on [the subsequent] inhuman turn of events. The matter could have been resolved by the expedient of a transfer of the population accompanied by a transfer of personal property, the likes of which history offers us many an example. That is what Hitler was proposing."

In spite of the outbreak of hostilities in September 1939, this policy of population transfer remained the ultimate goal of the Hitler government, and, as the study that is printed in the final four chapters of this book demonstrates, such a population transfer actually did take place for the vast majority of European Jewry, although admittedly it occurred under inhumane and brutal conditions which caused numerous casualties. But, as the study also shows, such deaths were an unfortunate coincidence and were not the result of a deliberate policy of "genocide."

As an important revisionist historian in the tradition of the late American historian Harry Elmer Barnes -- through whose efforts, incidentally, this translation was commissioned -- Paul Rassinier left an impressive body of work, without doubt indispensable to a complete understanding of the events of the Twentieth Century. Among his works which have not been mentioned previously, is a large volume, rich in documentary material of prime importance and analyzed with his customary lucidity, concerning that gross example of "kangaroo justice" known as the Jerusalem Tribunal which passed judgment on Adolf Eichmann; it is entitled *Le véritable procès Eichmann ou Les Vainqueurs incorrigibles* (8).

Other works that should be noted include his *Candasse ou Le Huitième péché capital* (9), a "story beyond time" that is told a bit in the manner of Anatole France, and, above all, his *L'Opération Vicaire* (10) in which he admirably exposes the political operation which consisted, in conjunction with the play "The Deputy," in charging

Pope Pius XII with the crime of "having favored Nazism," and, in doing so, having favored the anti-Jewish persecutions conducted by the Nazis, whereas, to the contrary, the Pope condemned those policies. Interestingly, as if by chance, there were found in rather great numbers in the gaggle of the Pope's accusers people who had helped Hitler to come to power.

To the everlasting credit of Paul Rassinier is the fact that with his *L'Opération "Vicaire"* he undertook the defense of the "highest moral authority on earth" in spite of the fact that he was a professed atheist. It was likewise honorable for this former deportee, the poor victim of the hell of the concentration camps, to refrain from capitalizing on his experiences as a camp inmate and, instead, to put himself at the service of historical truth concerning the German camps and the "Jewish holocaust." Clearly, Paul Rassinier belonged, as his friends and admirers were always able to appreciate, to this elite of men whose sole ambition is never to repudiate themselves and to conserve an unswerving allegiance to the principles they have chosen to serve.

July, 1977

FOOTNOTES

1 *Those Responsible for the Second World War* (Paris: Nouvelles Editions Latines, 1967).

2 *The Parliament in the Hands of the Banks* (Paris: Contre-Courant, 1955).

3 *The Crossing of the Line* (Paris: Editions Bressanes, 1950).

4 *The Lie of Ulysses* (Paris: La Librairie Française, 5th ed., 1961).

5 *Ulysses Betrayed by his Own* (Paris: La Librairie Française, 1961).

6 *The Drama of the European Jews* (Paris: Les Sept Couleurs, 1964).

7 (Richmond, Surrey: Historical Review Press, [1976]). See pages 9-13 for a bibliographical essay concerning other "revisionist" titles as well as other source material.

8 *The Real Eichmann Trial or the Incurable Victims* (Paris: Les Sept Couleurs, 1963).

9 *Candasse or the Eight Capital Sin* (Paris: L'Amitié par le Livre, 1955).

10 *Operation "The Deputy, "* (Paris: La Table Ronde, 1965).

Part I The Author's Experience

Chapter One

Prologue

It rained a fine, cold, icy April rain; steady, relentless, and inexorable. It had rained for two days and the third night was beginning.

The train, a long line of cars grinding along the rails slowly disappeared into the blackness. The engine, a locomotive of another era, sweated, blew and strained, coughed and spat, slipped and back-fired. A hundred times it hesitated, and a hundred times it seemed to refuse to make the effort expected of it.

It rained unceasingly. In the gondola car open to the sky were eighty huddled cringing bodies, intertwined, on top of each other. Were they living? Were they dead? No one could say. In the morning they woke once more, frozen in their miserable rags; they were emaciated and hollow with their eyes staring out, feverish and dazed. With a superhuman effort they shook themselves. They were aware of the daylight. They felt the rain - the stinging slashes of the rain - go through their ragged clothing, to their thin and hardened flesh, reaching to the very bone. They arched their backs with an imperceptible shudder. Perhaps, they were just beginning to make those thousands of instinctive, waking up movements, when they saw themselves reflected in each other's eyes. Through the fog of fever and the sheet of water falling from the skies, they noticed the men in uniform, armed to the teeth, planted in the four corners of the car, impassive but vigilant. Then they remembered. They realized their destiny, and with a start, dejected and overwhelmed, they fell back into that half sleep, that half life, that half death.

It rained, and rained, on and on. A heavy fetid air rose from the mass of bodies, and disappeared into the cold wetness of the night.

When they had left there were a hundred of them. They had been collected together in a hurry, with dogs at their heels and thrown pell-mell in groups into the train, under blows and shouted commands. They were horror stricken when they found themselves about to leave from the small platform, without provisions for the journey. Suddenly they understood that a great ordeal was beginning.

"*Achtung, Achtung!*" they were warned. "On your feet during the day; sit down during the night!... *Nicht Verschwinden* Any breaking of the rule, *sofort erschossen!* understand?"

The open car, the cold, and the rain, that was one thing- that had been seen before. But, nothing to eat, nothing to eat!

To cap their misery, for weeks there had not been an ounce of bread in the camp, and they had had to make do with supplies from the storage pits: plain soup of rutabaga, a quart sometimes half a quart, and small potatoes, in the evening, after a long, hard day of work. Nothing to eat. Everything else vanished before this menace. The sound of the Americans seven and a half miles away barely reached them.

Standing during the day, sitting down at night...! Before the end of the first night, three or four of them who had shown too precipitately a desire to satisfy a pressing need, were seized by the collar, smacked brutally against the high wall of the car and executed point blank: Craa-ack! against the wood, craa-ack! They did it in their pants, cautiously at first, holding themselves so as to soil themselves as little as possible; then, progressively they gave up.

Three or four others who had fallen down with exhaustion during the following day, were coldly finished off with a bullet in the head. Craa-ack! against the floor, craa-ack! The bodies were tossed out, as the train rolled along, after the registration numbers were removed. At the beginning of the third night, the ranks were considerably thinned, and fear gave way to terror, and terror to complete resignation. Abandoned was any urge to escape this hell, any urge to live; they let themselves die in their own excrement.

And still it rained, on and on and on. A little breeze riffled across the convoy, and the bit of canvas, that make-shift shelter under which in each corner the guard passed his long hours of watch, was lifted. It was as if the miasma were blown away, and the S.S. man, nervous at first, fussing about although in a determined way, suddenly became concerned. For some time, fewer rifle shots were heard, and there was less machine gun chattering. The dogs themselves-oh those dogs!-barked and yelped less at the numerous stops. In 48 hours, due to the constant changing of direction from side-track to side-track, the train was less than twelve and a half miles from where it started. Late in the afternoon it set off toward the southwest, after having tried the north, the south, and east in vain. If this track was cut like the others, it would mean that we were trapped and that we would be taken. The S.S. guards frowned, and then passed the news on from car to car, throughout the length of the train. "We are trapped, we will be captured!" They were completely bowled over. They were going to be captured, and all of these half conscious prostrate bodies were going to come back to life, rise up to accuse them; they would be caught red-handed.

Still, during the morning we heard them frequently calling out questions to each other with guttural voices, cracking jokes, and laughing coarsely at the sad and disabused girls who all along the right of way gave them back only occasional and melancholy encouragement. Now they were silent, only the click of a lighter, or the red end of a cigarette, from time to time broke this death-like silence, or disturbed the thick and humid obscurity of the night.

It rained endlessly, on and on. On top of this, the wind had become stronger. It began to whistle sharply between the boards, and the water came down in torrents. The canvas cover over one S.S. guard ballooned up, and its props gave way. Suddenly, the tent cloth began to flutter like a flag and to flap against the wall of the car. The S.S. swore. Then, grumbling and swearing, he tried in vain to repair the damage. If he got it attached on one side, the wind tore it off on the other! "*Gott Verdammt!*"

After two futile attempts he gave up. Suddenly, he turned toward the nearest of the miserable creatures, and gave a few shoves with his knee. "*Du*," he cried. "*du... Du. blöder Hund!*" *Blöder Hund?* The man heard, understood where the cry came from, automatically collected all the strength left in him, and got up frightened. When he saw what he was expected to do, he felt a little reassured. He raised himself onto the top of the wooden side of the car where he balanced on his hands and knees. Then, very carefully so as not to fall over the other side onto the road bed, he brought in the canvas, and helped the guard to fix the corners onto the supports.

"*Fertig?*" (Finished?) "*Ja, Herr S. S.* "

And, then an extraordinary thing happened. He came to his senses all of a sudden. All of a sudden the thought came to him that he was on his knees on the top edge of the wall, that his two legs were turned toward the outside, that the train was not moving very fast, that it was raining, that the night was black, and that the Americans were perhaps seven or so miles away, that freedom... Freedom, oh liberty! With that evocation, a sudden madness filled him who just a little while before was afraid of falling-oh irony-a light filled his brain, flooded his whole being: "*Ja...*" he repeated; then cried, "*Ja! Ja! Ja!...a...a. . . ah!*"

Before the S.S. guard even had time to register surprise, the man, the half-dead skeleton, tightened his muscles in one supreme effort, propped his poor thin arms on the edge of the board, and threw himself backward. He heard the crackling of gunfire ringing in his head, and he still found the strength, the astonishing lucidity, to realize that he had fallen into a spot, that was out of the line of fire. He felt himself caught there, body and soul, and he collapsed into the nothingness of unconsciousness. A machine gun continued to fire: Tch!. . . Tch!... Clac! Tcheretchstche!... Clac !... Tch!... Clac! Taratatata!... Tche!... Tche!... Tche!... Tche!... The locomotive sweated and blew, hesitated, slid and back-fired, and the train moved on. The guns stopped spitting death. Little by little the great indifferent silence of nature asleep closed over the drama going on, disturbed only by the hissing of the rain that now became steady with the dying of the wind. It rained on and on and on.

It was no longer raining. Hours had gone by, two, three, four, perhaps. The heavens had finally given up. In the thick and spongy night something next to the iron rail moved.

First, two eyes tried to open, but the heavy eyelids sank down in a sudden reflex, as though the head were under water.

His dry throat contracted to salivate and brought up the taste of earth on his tongue. An arm sketched a movement which was paralyzed in mid air by a sharp pain in the elbow, dull at the shoulder. Then, nothing more; the man lost himself again in a strange sense of well-being, and actually thought that he was falling asleep.

Suddenly, a shiver came over him and enveloped him. His chest was bared of its wet covering, brrr!... He wanted to curl himself up to get warm. Then, he tried to wake up.

His eyelids fluttered nervously, and he forced them to stay open. He stared into the opaque blackness.

A desire to cough rose up from his lungs and shattered him. He had the feeling that his body was acting in sections, independently and aching, in the dripping grass, and on the muddy ground.

He tried to think. Like a knock in his head came the thought "The dogs." This time he did wake up. He reviewed everything. A flood of experiences assailed him, one after the other: the loading, the train, the hell of the railroad car, the cold, the hunger, the canvas, the wind, the jump into the night. The train; what if it should come back over the same way once again? The dogs! Oh! Any death but that.

He wanted to flee; there was nothing else to do, but the pieces of his body were riveted there. He wanted to gather himself together, he heard his bones grating against each other. But, he had to get away from there, at any cost.

His reasoning took another turn: a railway line was a military objective for the attackers and a defensible breastwork for those attacked. The Germans would return to make use of it as a defensive line, and they would find him.

To flee! To get a few hundred yards from the railway right of way and wait there would be a little safer. The Americans would eventually come. "But, first, stand up! First, stand up." He was thinking out loud and the murmur from his lips brought forth from his mouth gritty bits of earth. He sputtered.

With infinite carefulness he moved his arms one after the other; the left seemed all right, but from the right came that pain in the elbow and shoulder. "Well, well, it seems to be going away." He repeated the motion, and it was true; the pain grew less as he moved his muscles and joints. Nothing was broken. He breathed easier. Now the legs. Gently he moved his muscles. He felt no pain; nothing was broken there either—at least it did not seem so. He became calmer.

He managed to sit up. His bruises became more painful, and his wet sticking clothes became more icy. He shivered. In the pit of his stomach he felt a round ache. He was hungry, and that was a good sign. He was surprised that he had not felt this hunger before. He put his hand to his head, his prison beret was still in place. This fact made him laugh. He thought of his clogs which he had lost during his jump; never mind. He felt all over himself: he was covered with mud and was rolled up in a tangle of wire from which he at once tried to extricate himself. He turned and got on all fours; one more effort and he would be standing up

On his feet; he was standing; he *would* get away; the Germans could double back, cling to the railway... not so fast; his head was spinning. He felt like vomiting. He felt himself tottering, about to fall. He stiffened, held himself upright as long as he could, and saw that he was going to collapse and that he might hurt himself in the fall. So, gently and very carefully, he crouched down. If he could not walk, he would drag himself, but he would not stay there; no, he would not stay there. He thought of the train, the dogs, and the Germans who would be coming back. And, he thought of the

Americans... "To think that they are there seven miles away. No, it would be too stupid."

On his hands and knees, crawling like a huge tormented worm, he managed to go down a slope, to cross what seemed to be a ditch, full of gluey water, and to slither along a newly ploughed section of an adjacent field where the earth came up in hunks and stuck to his knees, his legs and his elbows. He stopped and got his breath back.

Meanwhile the night had become less black and the sky was higher. Already the shapes of the hedges and the single trees around him could be made out in the thinning fog. Day was about to break and that was another danger. A few hundred yards away on a little rise of ground he made out a dark mass: woods, no doubt.

He made it his first objective to reach them before dawn. He started to move again. The struggle had warmed his body, had loosened his muscles and his joints, and had localized the pain down the whole length of his right side. He succeeded in standing up, in staying up, in putting one foot before the other, and in walking. He walked slowly because his right leg pulled and his shoulder was very painful. But, he was walking, and he made progress. Bent over, dead beat, broken, twisted, he pulled himself toward the woods. He straightened up, forced himself, and kept hold of himself. He would be there before dawn, and would take cover there; the Americans would come, and he would be saved. The rest took place in a dream a long, dead tired, slow-motion dream.

* * * *

When he arrived at the edge of the woods, he gave up the idea of hiding deep inside, which could prove treacherous, and decided it was wiser to sit down there, partially concealed in the low brush from which he could observe all sides.

Day broke. The ground which sloped down from his feet gradually appeared out of the darkness; the indistinct checkerboard pattern of fields and meadows became more outlined: the railroad tracks down below stood out like a long ribbon. In between two distant hills, a church spire rose among little wisps of smoke rising straight up from invisible chimneys. Very quickly the radiant spot in the still grey sky, which announced the sun piercing the clouds, was high in the sky. The country-side was animated here and there with yokes of oxen peacefully going and coming. A man, a civilian too, but whose brassard could be distinguished, had nonchalantly begun to do his stint along the tracks.

The sight evoked in him the image of a similar corner of the earth in similar weather, under the same sky, and with the same checkerboard of fields and meadows, the same woods, the same isolated trees, the same church steeple, and the same railroad somewhere in the vicinity of Alsace and Franche-Comté.

It occurred to him that if his mother could see this scene at this very hour, she would certainly have commented that the sky was "washing itself" or that the weather was "drying itself off." For a long time he watched two horses about five hundred yards away who were pulling a sort of harrow, over a square of meadow, to "scatter" the mole hills; the old man guiding them, surely that was father Tourdot, and that good

little girl pulling on a rope attached to the back of the harrow that was his granddaughter, whose father, Tony, was a prisoner in Germany! In an association of ideas he saw the worried face of his wife bending over a little bit of a fellow two years old... Then, the reality of his present situation came to him with a start of anxiety.

No, no, it was a trap! The Americans couldn't be seven miles away because everything was too quiet. Nothing in these fields and meadows and these woods gave a sign of war, much less of a complete collapse. He was crushed; what was going to become of him? He could not approach those people in his prisoner's clothing! He was hungry, very hungry, and thirsty, and he picked up a twig which he put into his mouth that was another remedy of his mother's, when he had cried into her skirts with thirst in the hot afternoons during the harvest. It took his mind off it.

The hours went by; the sun managed to pierce the greyness and to clear up the sky. A church bell rang; noon it was. The afternoon went by in the same way. The teams of animals became more numerous under a hotter sun which completely dried his garments. A man went by near him, a hoe over his shoulder, and almost brushed against him. He didn't move a muscle, but he realized that he couldn't stay there much longer without being discovered. The next day was Sunday, he had no trouble deciding that since they had left the camp on a Wednesday evening. So, in the morning he would be all right, but in the afternoon he would have a lot to worry about, since the Germans, large and small, liked to walk in the woods

Evening came, then the night. The moon, a huge moon, the color of embers, shed its strange light over the country. The guard on the tracks was still going back and forth. There had been no alert; in fact, there had not been the least little noise of an airplane motor in the sky during all day long. But, now he heard heavy thuds sounding in the distance. He thought, "They are still twenty-five or thirty miles away. The dogs, if they are set after me, will find me before the Americans get here. I must go, go toward them, but which way first?"

He was about to despair of everything when the sound of aircraft gave him back his courage. Airplanes wheeled above him and dropped their bombs in the immediate vicinity, without in the least being disturbed by anti-aircraft fire. Then they went away, and others came; a continual coming and going until dawn.

Daylight came, and the fog quickly broke up under a bright sun. All at once the day became clear. It was a beautiful springtime Sunday morning that gave no hint of what was to come. It might have been ten o'clock when the great upheaval finally came. Tac! Tac! Tacatacatatac!.... Tac! He estimated the distance: two to three miles at the most. It came from the direction of the church and a little beyond. Tac ! Tac!.... tac tac tac!.... Tac!

The machine gun persisted, and another replied. Toc! Toc! toc toc! Toc toc!

Then a great uproar: Boom! boom! Boom!. . . Boom! The projectiles did not fall far away, but still on the other side of the village. Boom! Boom! ... boom, boom A pause, Boom!

. . boom!... Another pause. Boom! Boom! Boom! Boom! Boom!... Boom! They came right at him; the discharge was regular, sharp, ringing. It would soon be time to do something, but what? A formidable explosion tore the air behind him; a shell had almost fallen on top of him. Brr. . . oom! Then another. Brr. . . oom! His ear drums were bursting with it! Brr. . . oom! Br. . . oom! It didn't stop, and was echoed from behind. Boom!... Boom!... Boom!... Boom!... The countryside was deserted, and the man with the brassard had disappeared. He was alone. Brr... oom!... Boom, boom, boom, Brou... Br... oom!

He was on the axis of a trajectory that was cut almost at right angles by the rail tracks, along which the Germans were doubling back. They would try to defend it, but they could not hold out for long in the face of the artillery fire; they would then retreat into the woods, where they would find him. "No, he must not stay there!"

He got up. He went down the slope, veering toward the left to get out of the line of the trajectory. His leg hardly dragged any more, the earth was dry, the ground was hard, and he was in possession of all his faculties. The last act of the tragedy was about to be played, and no false step must be made. "Not too near the tracks, not too near the forest," he decided.

The artillery duel continued: Boom! . . . Boom! . . . Boom! . . . Boom! . . . The shells came down again; they were hitting the tracks. He saw the earth explode in a long line which cut obliquely across the tracks. He could smell the burning explosives. "The Devil! Get Down!" He would have liked to go farther on, but He saw a single bush that was near by: a poor shelter. He preferred a deep trough which separated two farm plots; he threw himself down in it.

ZZ. . . Boom! . . . ZZ. . . Boom! Just in time! The shell whistled over his head and fell near him. The thunder behind him, which had ceased, began again, the sounds were heavier and farther away. They were drawing back!

While the American lengthened their fire, the Germans shortened theirs, following their withdrawal step by step. Suddenly, he found himself in the very center of a terrifying earthquake, a cloud of smoke, iron, earth. He was almost buried in earth and wondered what miracle had saved him from being pulverized.

As the dust settled, he risked taking a look around him. He could see forms in field grey who were crossing the tracks, one after the other, in rapid spurts between bursts of machine gun fire. They flattened themselves against the embankment; a burst of fire! They were up and moving again. Down again, another burst of fire! They retreated toward him, trying to get out of the open, to make it to the woods. Down . . . a burst of fire; fifteen steps back, a burst of fire . . . down again. "Let's hope that one of them doesn't throw himself down next to me!" he thought. A shot rang less than fifteen feet on his left, another less than five on his right. He could not see anyone. "What are they shooting at, Good Lord?"

The exploding artillery shells, little by little, reached the woods, and the chattering of machine gun fire raked it. More grey forms climbed up over the tracks and withdrew into the woods from which they directed their fire: Clac! . . . Clac! . . . Clac! . . .

Clac . . . Clac! But in the face of the brisk artillery fire, the reports from the forest grew weaker, and finally stopped altogether.

Suddenly there was a great clamor. It came from all corners of the horizon and echoed nearer and nearer, never ending. Suddenly, a host of men began to appear with rifles and machine guns in hand. While those who, a short while ago, had crossed the tracks amounted to a few dozen men, a hundred at the most, there were at least a thousand of these. They all seemed to be converging on the same point. Soon they were everywhere, walking and running. Not one of them saw him, which was just as well since one never knew what might happen at moments like these. He was careful not to make his presence known too soon. He waited for the excitement to subside. Finally he dared to move.

He sat up. About three hundred yards away some fifteen very nervous men, with their hands above their heads, were slowly emerging from the woods under the watchful eyes of guards, with their machine guns on the alert. In front of them, their backs to the woods, other men were already lined up, their hands resting on their heads, rigid. Finally others with their arms raised high appeared one by one; they threw their guns to the ground, took off their equipment, and took their places in the lineup.

"Jump to it!" One of them, too slow, was reminded of his new status with a well placed kick. Another received a blow with a gun-butt. A third tried to argue; Cra-a-ac! A machine gun was fired point blank at his chest. A few more blows, kicks, and slugs with the gun-butt, and the column was ready. "Get marching, toward the church!"

The group passed him at a distance of about seventy-five yards. The prisoners, in rows of five, completely stripped of equipment, jackets unbuttoned, and hands behind their heads shuffled by, awkward, silent and docile. On both sides an armed cordon of seven or eight men showered them with insults and warnings. He decided that it was time to show himself, and he rose up with a leap. "Hey! . . . Hey! . . . " he shouted, and he raised one arm in a gesture of appeal.

Without delay, the group halted, four men detached themselves on the run, and before he had time to realize what was happening to him, the barrels of four machine guns were pressed against his chest and back. "Like this, at least, I know they won't shoot!" he thought. The questions all came at once, menacing and in a language that he did not understand.

"French man," he said. It was all the English that he knew and he wasn't sure that was right. They looked at him round-eyed, astonished and mistrustful. He was obviously not understood. Then, he said, "*Française!*" This was not understood either. He tried his last resource: "*Französische Häftling! Franzous!*" This time it worked; one of the machine guns was lowered.

"Was?" He briefly explained, in broken phrases, and he saw that he was in the presence of a German, two Spaniards and a Yugoslav, whose lingua franca was Italian. They had understood, all the machine guns were lowered, and a canteen was offered to him. He drank a bitter cold drink, which he wanted to spit out. He grimaced. "*Koffé,*" said the German, "*gut Koffe.*" They got out dry biscuits, hard, hard, oh how hard, chocolate, tins, cigarettes Cigarettes! First a cigarette But, they

must not waste time. "*Schnell*," said the German, "*Wir müssen...*" (Hurry we have to) They saw what condition he was in. Two of them hoisted him onto their shoulders, and like a living trophy took him, laughing, to the group which was waiting. "*Sin-Sin?*" asked one of the fellows of the escort. "Yes," he answered. But, the others said nothing. There was only one Englishman-or an American-in the company... which was a kind of international brigade, and he thought of the Spanish War.

As evening fell, the little column resumed its march toward the church, with the emaciated figure keeping his balance with difficulty on the shoulders of the two men, while nibbling slowly, his mouth watering copiously, on the biscuits and the chocolate. The sarcastic comments, the warnings, and the oaths, continued to rain on the prisoners, who, always docile, moved along, awkwardly in the unlaced shoes, their heads hung down their two hands crossed at the nape of their necks. "*Porco Dio. . . Gott Verdammt!*" From time to time the German spoke up: "*Du! Blöder Hund!... Du!!*" And, he pointed to a prisoner. Then, taking his revolver out of its holster, he asked him, "*Muss ich erschiessen?*" (Shall I shoot?) The prisoner rolled his frightened and pleading eyes, waiting for the answer a neutral, resigned smile. "*Du hast Glück! Mensch! Blöder Hund!*" (You're lucky ... stupid dog) he said and spat contemptuously, "*tt!... Lumpe.*" The roles were reversed.

From insult to insult, gibe to gibe, and threat to threat, the column of triumphant conquerors and disappointed losers made their entrance into the village just before midnight. They were past a station, very small, just like others that he knew, in Franche-Comté and Alsace. On the front he read "Munschof" in Gothic lettering. They set him down on the ground and the column rested. Then, slowly they started up again, amidst the deafening noise of the imposing war machines which at full speed went through the deserted but intact village on to new positions. Sometime later, the column reached the headquarters encampment.

An odd little fellow was the Commanding Officer: English, German, Italian, French; he seemed to be familiar with all languages. And, then there was that tone, that manner:

"First, find a place to stay, my friend, eat, get your strength back, rest, a good bed. Then, we will see Knock at the first door that strikes you as a good place No, no, not with my men, they haven't the time, the hell with them now. Knock; if they open the door to you, ask for something to eat, hot, you need something hot. You will get a little something extra, from us, cold of course If they don't open, go in just the same, whether there is someone there or not; make yourself at home; all these people are our servants, it is their turn All they have to do is behave properly. No, no, don't be afraid, at the slightest lack of respect Come back to see me tomorrow. Until then Not wounded? Not sick? ... Yes, of course, weak, just weak. Until tomorrow then. And try to find another pair of shoes there... and another dinner jacket!"

The next day he went back. The Commanding Officer was sitting in an armchair on the porch, playing around with two very pretty persons, laughing out loud, who

seemed to be quite ready "to behave properly" in the military sense of the phrase as applied to civilians of the opposite sex. "The female always submits to the conqueror with smiles," he thought. In France, in 1940 All of them, girls from Colas Breugnon.

But, the Commanding Officer said at once: "Ah, there you are! You know, since last evening I have been handed quite a lot of people like you. Since dawn my men haven't stopped bringing them to the *Arbeitsdienst* camp. What am I going to do with them, Good Lord? There is a train load of them, a train! And me, I haven't any way to transport them to the rear! They are all going to die; they'll all die! What sort of a place was it that you were in. Ah! the skunks! Well, don't worry about it, old boy, these two girls"

"Good," he began again, "You can walk?... Then, don't go to the *Arbeitsdienst* camp Go West, my friend, toward the West. Escapee, get there on your own, on friendly ground Hague Convention, deportee, priority Signal the first ambulance you run into. In eight days you'll be in Paris. All the laws, I'm telling you we'll see that you have something to eat to take with you. Really, is that all you have found since last evening? You'll give a fright to the girls all the way, old boy. Wasn't there anything where you spent the night? We won the war, in God's name!... She's pretty good that one! Ah, these French, you can't ever teach them anything *Frantz!*"

Then he added in a few words in Anglo-German lingo:

"Also, bye, bye! Follow the guide, he's going to give you something to take along. Good luck, but... try to do better the next time!"

Well weighed down with canned food, sugar, chocolate, biscuits and cigarettes, among other things... which he didn't know where to put, he found himself outside. He wanted to see the train from which he had escaped, and he turned toward the station.

People, civilians and soldiers, were busily going back and forth along the platforms. They made room for him as he came along: the clothes that he wore gave him a sort of respect. Gangs of men were pulling from the cars, the half clothed bodies, in rags, lank, dirty, bearded, and muddy! Some civilians were helping and watching them, full of pity, horrified. The dead bodies were lined up along the edge of the tracks, after their numbers, if there were any on their rags, were taken down. He looked to see if he could find anyone he knew among the dead Two men, two German civilians, arrived carrying a big thin body. "*Kaput?!!*" one of them said. "*Nein,*" answered the other, "*atmet noch....*" (Finished No, he's still breathing.) He recognized Barry; Barry!

Barry was an engineer from St. Etienne. In camp they had slept together on the same straw mat for three weeks and had become friends. They had promised to write to each other if they got out. He learned from one of the survivors that the poor man had gone down under the blows of some German prisoners for having, in the delirium of hunger, cold and fever, begun to sing the *Marseillaise*. The S.S. guards had stood by unconcerned during the show. "Barry!" "It's all over," he said to himself.

And, he went away thinking that there was a fatality in things that some premonitions did come about in life: for fifteen days, at least, Barray had been swearing by all the Gods that they would be freed on Quasimodo (Low) Monday He promised himself to write to his widow and two children about whom they had so often talked before they went to sleep.

A survivor told him what had happened to the convoy. A mile and a quarter beyond the station, it had been brought to a halt, very early Saturday morning. The S.S. guards had hurriedly made all of the able-bodied men get down from the cars and had formed them into a long endless line, which trailed away into the landscape, accompanied by the howling of the dogs and the sound of gun shots. The S.S. had left - on the train - the dead, the dying, and all of those who, taking advantage of the general confusion, were lucky enough to pass for dead. Obviously, there were too many of them, and there wasn't time to kill them one by one-nor was there the desire to do so. (Since this was written, it has been determined that there was no order to kill the prisoners, either.)

He continued his inspection. In one wide open car that no one was paying any attention to, the surviving prisoners shivered in spite of the full sun; they crawled out from under the pile of dead bodies; they huddled together to protect themselves from a cold that they alone felt. "What are you waiting for?" "Well... waiting to die, can't you see?" "What?" "There are still fourteen of us living; all the rest are dead; we are waiting our turn...." He could not understand how they could be so little concerned with the saving of their lives. "They have given up," he thought; "It is not worthwhile to bother with them. They are already 'dead' and are satisfied. To force them back to life would be to inflict a kind of punishment on them"

And, he went on, with a feeling of indifference. He had known many prisoners in the camp who had been burdened with a sort of "death wish" and whom one could never meet without thinking that they were already dead, but that their bodies, in some manner, had survived them They were the ones who never missed a chance to announce, to drum it into one, that the war would be over in two months, that the Americans were here, that the Russians were there, that Germany was in revolution, and so forth. They were irritating, and they exhausted one's patience. Then, one fine day they were seen no more. The two months-or whatever-had gone by, and, since nothing had happened, they had just "let go of the railing," as it was said, and had let themselves die on the appointed date. These prisoners had let go of the railing right at the winning post; the two months had ended there, and the day of liberation had arrived! He knew from experience that there was nothing to do. But, two steps farther on a feeling of remorse overcame him. "Don't stay like that; get out of there; the Americans are here; they are emptying the next car, and they will get to you soon. They will give you something to eat; there is a hospital in the village." They did not believe him, but he had made peace with himself.

At the end of the train was a boxcar that was filled with supplies; sacks of peas, flour, canned goods, packages of every sort of ersatz goods imaginable, liquor, beer, liqueurs, suits of clothes, shoes, accessories, and equipment. He took a soldier's nap sack and a pair of Italian shoes, with cloth sides and low-heels, which fitted his feet wonderfully. Then he left, eager to leave behind all that misery.

But, he still wanted to see the *Arbeitsdienst* camp where the Commanding Officer had told him that the Americans were taking those inmates who were still living. On the mustering grounds, surrounded by wooden buildings, living skeletons were coming and going, and corpses lay crumpled here and there... There were some five or six hundred men milling about. Well-wishing nurses - attached to the American army - busied themselves among them, running from one to another. The nurses did their utmost in vain to try to get the inmates to understand that they should stay inside the barracks and rest on the straw mattresses. Few among them had in their hearts any desire to live. Those who might have been saved began to die of dysentery because they had, disregarding all warnings, stuffed themselves too greedily with all of the food that was so profusely distributed among them. They ate, then felt a great need for air, and then went outside to die in the yard. No, no, this was no place for him. In the first place, he was too near the front lines; one could still hear the cannon fire all too sharply. He thought of Ulysses' return.

He made his way toward the villa where he had slept the night before and where another tug at his heart awaited him. On the way, he found an American soldier who wanted to shave him, amused.

To tell the truth, it was not a villa but the modest house of an engineer or a retired person just like so many in France- with an iron fence and a garden all around. The evening before he had found it empty with all the doors open. In the kitchen, the table had not even been cleared; a white cheese was on one plate, and jam was on another. In the dining room, the doors of a cupboard were swung open, and the linen and various other things were piled up on the sofa, on the table, and on the chairs, without thought. A trunk with its top gaping open sat waiting. The bedroom was in perfect order. He felt there the pressing distress of a comfortably well-off family who had hoped to the end and had waited until the last minute before leaving. "They aren't far away," he had thought, "They will come back any minute."

He had slept in the big bed in the bedroom; he had laid there lazily in the morning smoking a cigarette. He had stretched himself out under the warmth of the covers, under a wide beam of sunshine which shone on the polished furniture. Leaving this house, to go to the Commanding Officer's about ten o'clock in the morning, he had thought of what had happened to him in 1940 when, turning back into Alsace, he had wanted to go home one last time. He had caught himself holding a pencil to write a note which he would have stuck on the door if at the last moment a sort of pride, which he had always felt was misplaced, had not restrained him: "Make use of everything, steal nothing, break nothing. Do not take vengeance on things for what you reproach people for. Do not make individuals pay for what you believe is the error of the whole community." And so he had taken out of the linen cupboard only what was indispensable: a shirt a pair of under shorts, a handkerchief, and from under the kitchen sideboard the pair of imitation leather sandals that had made the Commanding Officer laugh so much... He had even resisted the very strong temptation, when passing in front of the garage, to borrow the magnificent Opel that was parked there.

Now everything had disappeared, the magnificent Opel was gone, the cupboards were emptied, the linen was stolen, and the dishes were broken. "And I who was so conscientious," he thought "The war, ah the war!" On the night table, an alarm clock

that he had noticed the night before was still there by some miracle It pointed to 6:30. He threw himself, still all dressed, onto the bed and went to sleep.

Early the next morning, when the sun was already high, he set off. The thunder of cannon was still rumbling in the distance, and behind him the mighty war machines rolled toward the front. At the edge of the village, in front of a house a little apart, some civilians were cooking something in a kettle balanced on two stones; there were about half a dozen of them, badly clothed, unwashed, unshaved, dirty, and he noticed that one of them kept the fire going with books which he picked up in bundles. He approached, curious. They were Belgian and Dutch laborers - volunteers who had worked in the factories in the area. The books were those from the *Hitler-Jugend-Bucherei* of the village.

He glanced at the titles: *Kritik über Feuerbach*; *Die Räuber* of Schiller; *Kant und der Moral*. Goethe, Hölderlin, Fichte, Nietzsche, and others, were all there as if at a tragic rendez-vous, and they were waiting for their fate to be decided by less noble lords, the Goebbels and the Streichers. The paper was fine, the bindings were unpretentious, and the workmanship was good. He had always had a weakness for books of any kind. He spotted one, *Du und die Kunst* by one of National Socialism's leaders. He opened it mechanically, and he saw a colored reproduction of "*La Liberté guidant le peuple*," by Delacroix. He leafed through it more attentively: Monet's flowers, a detail from Renoir, *la Joconde*, *Mme Récamier*, *le Martyr de Saint Sébastien*. This sharp contrast with the hell out of which he had just come made him ill. He asked if he could take this book away with him, as a souvenir of that civilization that had been so cruel to him, and which would astonish and shock the world for years to come. Permission to take the book was given with a smirk and a sneer. Of course it was difficult for them to understand.

He turned west again, with the feeling that he would never come upon an ambulance and that he would continue to the end on foot. All of a sudden, he felt that he was on the threshold of a new adventure, and that he would have liked to have it resemble, although in other times and under a different sky, that of Ulysses of whom he had thought the day before.

Before him he saw roads, the peasants in the fields, the hedges in bloom, the trees budding, the farms, the people who asked about him and to whom he gladly told his story, and the never ending roads. And, there at the end of this mirage-like horizon a small house with arbor vitae, on the outskirts of a small village. In the little yard, a little boy always two years old playing in the sand, who raised astonished eyes at seeing him arrive in his prison clothes... On the tip of his tongue he was about to ask, "What's your name? Little fellow? Where is your mama?" He wept.

Chapter Two

Swarms of Humanity at the Gates of Hell

The time was about six o'clock in the morning, but I could only guess. There were about twenty of us of all ages and backgrounds, all French, all dressed in the most unlikely rags, and all quietly sitting around a large table set on trestles. We did not know each other, and we made no attempt to become acquainted. Silent, or just about, we tried to read each other's expressions, and, although without much interest, to size each other up. We had the feeling that, united in a common fate, we were destined to live through some painful experience together and that we must therefore resign ourselves to the idea of depending on each other. But we acted as though we wanted to put that idea off until the last possible minute; it was not easy to break the ice.

Each man was absorbed in his own thoughts; we were trying to buck ourselves up and to understand what had happened to us: for three days and three nights, one hundred of us per car, hunger, thirst, madness, death, the unloading at night, in the snow, with the howling of men and the barking of dogs, with blows from some and swipes from others; the shower, the disinfection, the "gasoline tank," and so forth. We were all stupefied by what had happened. We had the feeling that we had just crossed a no-man's-land and that we had been in a more or less mortal obstacle course which had been carefully graduated and organized in every detail.

After the trip, and without any transition, we encountered a long string of halls, offices and underground corridors, each filled with strange and menacing people, who had their no less strange and humiliating specialties. Here, your wallet, wedding ring, watch, fountain pen; there your jacket, trousers, shorts, socks, shirt; in the last place, your name. They had stolen everything from us. Then came the barber who shaved us bald, the cresylic bath, and the shower. Finally the whole process was repeated in reverse: at one window a shirt that was falling to pieces; at another shorts with holes; at another pants with patches; and so on to the wooden clogs and the strip of cloth with the registration number. A frock coat thrown away, a military blouse no longer used, a Russian cap, a Bersagliers hat made up our clothing. We were not given back our wallets, wedding rings, fountain pens or watches.

"Just like Chicago," someone said, showing his number and joking, "there they go into the factory as pigs and come out as cans. Here we go in as men and come out as numbers." Nobody laughed; between the pig and the can in Chicago there is surely not much difference than between what we were and what we had become.

When we arrived in that large, light and clean hall, well aired and comfortable at first glance, we felt a sort of relief; the same feeling, doubtless that Orpheus felt coming out of Hades. Then we withdrew into our own preoccupations, to the one which dominated and checked any desire for inner speculations and which could be seen in the eyes of all: "Will we get anything to eat today?" When will we be able to sleep?"

We were at Buchenwald, Block 48, Wing A. It was six o'clock in the morning at a guess. And it was Sunday -- Sunday, January 30, 1944. A dark Sunday.

* * * *

The building which housed Block 48 was made of stone and had a roof that was covered with tiles; and, unlike almost all of the other buildings which were made of lumber, it had a ground floor and one story. There were toilets and washrooms on both floors; the washrooms had two large circular basins with places for ten or fifteen, and a stream of water coming down like a shower: the W.C.'s had six places for sitting and six for standing. On each side, with a space between, was a *Esszimmer* (refectory) with three large trestle tables and a *Schlafsaal* (dormitory) with thirty or forty bunk beds. One *Esszimmer* and one *Schlafsaal* in pairs, made up a wing, or *Flügel* the four *Flügel*, consisted of "A" and "B" on the ground floor and "C" and "D" on the first floor. The building covered about one hundred and twenty to one hundred and fifty square yards; twenty to twenty five yards long and five to six yards wide; the design was intended to provide a maximum of comfort in a minimum of space.

In preparing for our arrival the day before, the camp authorities had emptied Block 48 of its prior occupants. Only the administrative personnel who were attached to it remained: the Blockältester or the Block Chief; his *Schreiber* or bookkeeper; the barber, and the *Stubendienst* or barracks men. There were two *Stubendienst* per wing. In all, eleven persons ran the block.

Our group, which was the first to arrive, was housed in the Block Chief's *Flügel*. Little by little others came in. And, little by little the atmosphere livened, too, as tongues became loosened. Fellow countrymen who had been arrested at the same time, or in the same operation, met each other again. As for me, I had found Fernand again, who came to sit next to me.

Fernand was a former student of mine, a solid and conscientious worker, who was twenty years old. During the occupation he had just naturally turned to me. We made the trip to Compiègne chained together, and already at Compiègne we made a nice little island among the seventeen who were arrested in the same operation that had netted us. To tell the truth, we had decided to ignore them. First, there was the one who had set himself down at the interrogation table, then the inevitable career non-com who had become an insurance agent, and who, upon decorating himself with the Legion of Honor, had felt that it was indispensable to his dignity to promote himself to the rank of Captain. Then there were the others, steady and serious, whose silence and whose every look betrayed their awareness of the seriousness of their plight. The insurance agent, especially, annoyed us with his megalomania, his grandiloquent manners, his air of being in on God's secrets, and the stupidly optimistic exaggerations which he incessantly imposed on us. "Come on," Fernand had said to me, "they're not our kind of people."

At Buchenwald, where we had arrived in the same railroad car, we once again stuck together, and took advantage of a moment of inattention on the part of the group to slip away and to present ourselves one behind the other, for what can only be called prison registration formalities. Separated for an instant, we again found ourselves together with the group.

At eight o'clock in the morning, there wasn't room left to break an egg around the tables, and the chattering that went on was so noisy that it disturbed the Block Chief and the *Stubendienst*. Introductions, occupations and positions that had been held in the Resistance were shouted back and forth over the heads; bankers, big industrialists, twenty year old commanding officers, colonels hardly any older, the big chiefs in the Resistance, all having the confidence of London and in possession of military secrets, especially the landing date. In addition, there were a few professors, a few priests who timidly kept apart, and a few who said that they were simply job holders or workmen. Aside from these few, everyone wanted to have a social position more enviable than that of his neighbors: above all, one that included having been entrusted by London with a mission of the greatest importance. You could not count the number of brilliant feats. We two unpretentious people found ourselves crushed. "Upper crust, upper ten . . . Crud," Fernand whispered into my ear in a very, very low voice.

After a quarter of an hour, really tormented, we felt an irresistible urge to urinate. In the hallway which led to the WC an animated conversation among five or six persons was in progress. As we went by, we heard talk about millions of dollars. "God, what sort of a crowd have we fallen into?"

All the places were occupied in the WC; there was a line-up and we had to wait. On the way back, a good ten minutes later, the conversation was still going, and it still concerned millions. It was a matter then of some fourteen million. We wanted to find out what it was all about and stopped. It was a poor old fellow who was lamenting over the fabulous sums that the time he would spend in camp would cost him. "But then, sir," I ventured, what do you do in civilian life that would cause you to handle such large sums of money? You must have quite a position." And, I assumed an air of admiring commiseration when I said that. "Ah, don't talk about it." And, he showed me the wooden clogs he had on. I couldn't keep from laughing out loud. He did not understand and started to tell his story again for my benefit.

"You understand, first the Germans ordered a thousand pairs of them from me, which they came to get without checking either the number or the invoices. Then another thousand pairs, then two thousand, then five thousand, then . . . Lately the orders were pouring in. And, they never checked them. So I began to cheat a little on the quantity, then on the prices. What else can you do? The more money you take from them the weaker they get, and the job gets easier for the English. Sales boches, just the same! Then, one fine day they compared the invoices with the reports of their receiving clerks; you can expect anything from people like that. They found they had been robbed of about 10 million. And, so they sent me here. Directly. And, without any trial, Sir. But, can you see me, a thief? Ruined, I am going to be ruined Sir! And without any trial . . ."

He was truly shocked. Quite sincerely, he was under the impression that he had indisputably performed a patriotic service, and that he had been, although with so many others, the victim of an injustice. Another fellow nearby, without batting an eye began to explain, "That's just like me, Sir, I was a business manager in . . ." "O.K. Come on," Fernand said to me "You see!"

* * * * *

The days went by, and we familiarized ourselves, insofar as we could, with our new life. First, we learned that we were there to work, that we would soon be assigned to a *Kommando*, probably outside the camp, and that we would then go out "in transport." Meanwhile, we would remain in quarantine for three to six weeks, depending on whether or not an epidemic sickness broke out among us.

Then, the camp administration let us know something about the provisory regime that we would be required to follow. During the quarantine, we were absolutely forbidden to leave the Block or its small yard; in any case, it was surrounded with barbed wire. Every morning, we were roused at half past four, "with bugle," by the *Stubendienst*, with a rubber truncheon in hand for those tempted to lag behind; we washed on the run, and then received our food distribution for the day: 250 grams of bread; 20 grams of margarine; 50 grams of sausage or white cheese or jam, and a pint of ersatz coffee without sugar. Roll-call was held at half past five and lasted until half past six or seven. From seven to eight, we cleaned the block. At about eleven we got a quart of rutabaga soup and at about four o'clock the *cafe-trink*. At six o'clock there was another roll-call which could last until nine o'clock, rarely longer, but usually ended at eight. Then to bed. In between times, we were left to ourselves, sitting around the tables, and if we weren't too noisy about it, we could tell our little stories, our discouragements, our fears, our apprehensions, and our hopes. In fact, from morning to night, the talk centered around the date of the eventual end of hostilities and how they would end; the general opinion was that the war would be over in two months with one of us having gravely announced that he had received a secret message from London giving the beginning of March as the sure date for the landing.

Gradually Fernand and I became acquainted with the others in our group, while keeping our distance and remaining on our guard. In two days, we were sure that at least half of our companions in misery were not there for the reasons that they gave, and, in any case, they had had practically no connection with the Resistance. Most of these internees seemed to have been arrested for black market activities.

It was more difficult to adjust to the rhythm of things. Through the intermediary of a Luxemburger who knew hardly any French, the Block Chief made speeches to us explaining things every evening during roll-call; but, needless to say, it was hard to understand. The Block Chief was the son of a former Communist delegate to the *Reichstag*, who had been assassinated by the Nazis. He was a Communist and didn't conceal it, a fact which surprised me. The main gist of all of his palaver was that the French were dirty, that they talked like magpies, and were lazy, that they didn't know how to wash themselves, and that those listening to him had the double good luck of having arrived at a moment when the camp had become a sanitarium and of having been assigned to a Block whose Chief was a political and not a common criminal. One could not say that he was a bad fellow: he had been in prison for eleven years and had acquired the ways of the establishment. Rarely did he strike one; his displays of violence generally consisted of vigorous "*Ruhe!*" cutting across our talk, which were followed by imprecations in which there was always something about a crematorium. We were afraid of him, but we were much more afraid of the Russian and Polish *Stubendienst*.

We knew nothing, or almost nothing about the rest of the camp because of our confinement to the four *Flügel* of the Block. We sensed that there was work going on

around us and that the work was hard but we had only scuttlebutt to give us any idea of the nature of it. On the other hand, we knew very quickly about every nook and cranny of our Block, as well as the life stories of the occupants who lived there. There was a little of everything there: adventurers, people whose social origin and standing were very ill-defined; genuine Resistants; serious minded people; Crémieux, the attorney to the Belgian King, among others. It is hardly necessary to say that neither Fernand nor I felt any desire to attach ourselves to any one of the groups that formed.

* * * * *

The first week was especially distressing. Among us were the cripples the maimed with only one leg or with both legs gone, and the congenitally disabled, who had to leave their canes or their crutches or their artificial limbs at the entrance along with their wallets and jewelry. They dragged around miserably and we helped them or carried them. There were also the very seriously ill from whom had been taken away the indispensable medicines which they always carried on their persons; these persons died slowly. Then, there was the shock that is produced in all organisms by a brutal change in diet, both as to its quality and quantity. Then, all of our bodies began to suppurate; and the Block soon became a vast carbuncle which *ex tempore* doctors, or doctors without any supplies, tried to treat. Finally, on the moral level, various unexpected incidents made even more insupportable the promiscuity that had been imposed on us: the business manager, who had claimed the rank of Colonel, was caught stealing bread from one of the sick men whose nurse he had volunteered to be; a violent quarrel pitted the attorney to the King of the Belgians against a doctor over the division of a piece of bread a fellow, who went around from group to group claiming that he was going to be a magistrate after the Liberation, was surprised in the act of stealing for himself some extra food from the general rations, etc. . . . We were in the Court of Miracles.

All this stirred up the philanthropists. There is no Court of Miracles without philanthropists, and France, copiously endowed with them, perforce exported some to this place, who asked only to have their devotion noted and, if possible, to be remunerated. One fine day they cast a haughty glance of commiseration on this mass of men in rags and tatters abandoned to all of the machinations of the mind and possible victims of all of the perversions. The level of our morale seemed in danger to them, and they flew to its assistance, because in a situation like this the factor of morale was essential. So it is in life; there are those who grudge you your bread, others your freedom, and others your morale.

A man from Lyon, who said he was editor-in-chief of *l'Effort*, a Colonel, if my memory is good; a big supply official; and a lame man who called himself a Communist, but whom the people of Toulouse accused of having betrayed them to the Gestapo during his interrogation, got underway a program of regular singing and a series of lectures on various subjects. During the week, we heard a discourse on syphilis among dogs, another on the world petroleum production and the role of petroleum after the war, and a third on comparative labor organizations in Russia and America.

On Sunday afternoon, there was a continuous program from three to six, with a stage-manager. A dozen volunteers gave impromptu performances. The most mixed

feelings arose from the depths of their souls, and the most varied personalities displayed themselves: from the *Violon brisé* to the *Soldat alsacien*, and through *G.D.V.*, *Margot reste au village* and *Coeur de Lilas*. In addition the most daring broad jokes were told along with the most comical monologues. These clownish actions clashed with the place, the audience, the spot we were in, and with the preoccupations which should have occupied our minds. Definitely, the French well deserve the reputation for levity that the world has attributed to them.

Finally, an intelligent, handsome young man, twenty years old, with a warm voice, sang *La petite Eglise* by Jean Lumière and made everyone homesick. "*Je sais une église au fond du hameau . . .*" Everyone had tears in his eyes, faces resumed a human look, and the unbalanced became men again. I understood what "*le lent Galoubet de Bertrandou, le Fifre ancien berger*" meant to the Cadets of Gascogne de Cyrano de Bergerac. I forgave the philanthropists and, then and there, vowed eternal gratitude to Jean Lumière.

* * * *

A change of scene the second week revealed still more formalities that had to be carried out. On Monday morning medical orderlies burst into the block with hypodermic syringes in hand to administer vaccinations. On the way to the *Esszimmer*, everyone was caught in the corridor and was given one hypo after another. This operation was repeated three or four times with a few days in between. In the afternoon it was the *politische Abteilung* that descended on us and proceeded to conduct a detailed interrogation of one's civilian standing, profession, political convictions, reasons for having been arrested and deported. These interrogations took up three or four days and were conducted in between the vaccinations. And, then there was the "m . . . duty".

The "m . . . duty": ah! my friends! All the defecations of some 30 to 40 thousand inhabitants of the camp converged into a cone of excrement on a lower level. Since nothing was to be wasted, every day a special *Kommando* spread this precious commodity on the gardens attached to the camp which produced the vegetables for the S.S. and the foreign civilian workers who worked in and around the camp. Ever since the convoys of foreign prisoners began to provide a continuous supply of new manpower, the German prisoners, who were in charge of the administration of the camp decided that they would have this work done by the new arrivals; it took the place for them of the traditional farce played on the recruits in the casernes in France, and it amused them enormously. This duty was the most painful one. The prisoners were harnessed in pairs to a *Trague* (a wooden basket in the shape of a pyramid with a rectangular base) which contained the stuff; they then went back and forth from the reservoir to the gardens, like horses in a circus, for twelve consecutive hours, in the cold and in the snow. In the evening they returned to the Block dog-tired and stinking.

One day we were told, without even being detailed to a *Kommando* that our Block was to quarry rock each morning and each afternoon during the rest of the quarantine period. The Block Chief had decided that instead of sending out groups of a hundred men who would work in relays for a period of twelve hours, it would be easier on us for all of us to go at once, that is, all four hundred, and to stay out only two hours for each shift. Everybody agreed. From that day on, every morning and every evening we

filed across the camp to get to the *Steinbruch* where we picked up a stone whose weight was what our strength could manage. We dragged it back to the camp where gangs broke it up for street pavement. Then we went back to the Block. This work was light, particularly in comparison with that of the quarry workers who excavated the stone under the insults and the blows of the *Kapos*, the abbreviation for *Konzentrationslager Arbeitpolizei*, or police in control of labor.

Four times a day we passed close to villas where rumor had it that Léon Blum, Daladier, Reynaud, Gamelin and Princess Mafalda, daughter of the King of Italy, were imprisoned. We all envied the lot of those privileged people. Every time we passed, I heard comments: "Wolves don't eat each other!" "All depends on whether we are powerful or miserable . . ." "The big shots, old boy, you break your neck for them and they bow to each other." "Hitler's race laws apply to all Jews but one." And, the like.

In our ranks there was a former prime minister of Belgium, a former French minister, and other personages, more or less important. They were more mortified than we at the treatment enjoyed by the inhabitants of the villas. It was said that each of them had two rooms, a radio, German and foreign newspapers, and three meals a day. Moreover, we were sure that they didn't have to work. Leon Blum (1) was especially envied. Chance had it that during one trip, Fernand and I, who never left each other, found ourselves next to the French minister. "Why Léon Blum and not me?" he said to us. Judging by the tone of his voice, we gathered that he did not find it at all strange that we should be detailed to those low jobs fit for slaves, but for him, really, a former minister! Fernand shrugged his shoulders. I was puzzled.

Another day, instead of taking us to the *Steinbruch*, we were taken to the criminal anthropometry department where our photographs, face and profile, and our finger prints were taken. Coarse, fat, well-fed individuals, but prisoners just like ourselves, each with a brassard on the arm of some authority or other, and each with a rubber truncheon in the hand to back it up, yelled at our heels. In front of me were Dr. "X" and the little Communist cripple who was in the good graces of the Block Chief and who was considered by the French to be his confidential agent. I listened to their conversation. Doctor "X," whom everyone knew had been several times a candidate for the U.M.R. in various elections, was explaining to the cripple that he was not a communist, but not an anti-Communist either, far from it. The war had opened his eyes, and, perhaps, when he had time to assimilate the doctrine . . . For two days a possible move to Dora had been talked about, and Doctor "X" was beginning to lay the ground work so that he could stay at Buchenwald. Misery!

Suddenly I felt a terrible blow. Absorbed in reflections that had been stimulated by this conversation, I must have strayed a little from the ranks. I turned around and got an avalanche of insults in German of which I made out "*Hier ist Buchenwald, lumpe schau mal, dort ist Krematorium!*" (This is Buchenwald, take a look you, there is the Crematorium.) That was all I was to know about the reason for the assault. By the way of explanation, and to justify it, the little cripple turned to me and said, "You could have been more careful; that's Thaelmann!"

We arrived at the entrance to the anthropometry department where somebody else with brassard and truncheon pushed us brutally in line against the wall. This time it

was the little cripple who got a blow and who was soundly imprecated. The storm passed, and he turned to me, and said, "That doesn't surprise me coming from that S.O.B.; that's Breitscheid." I did not in the least care who in the world these two fine fellows were. But, I smiled at the thought that the Communists had finally realized that unity of action that they had talked about so much before the war, and I admired that acute sense of difference which the little cripple felt even in his reflexes.

* * * *

I was a pessimist; at least, that was my reputation. First, I refused to take seriously the optimistic news that Johnny reported each evening to the Block. Johnny was a Negro. The first time that I saw him was at Compiègne where I heard him say, with a strong American accent, that he was a Captain of a Flying Fortress and that during a raid on Weimar, when his aircraft was hit, he had had to parachute. When he got to Buchenwald he began to talk French fluently and called himself a doctor of medicine. He spoke two other languages almost as well as French: German and English. Thanks to this advantage, to his imagination, and to the fact that he was undeniably cultivated, he managed to get assigned as a doctor in the *Revier* (sick ward) even before quarantine was ended. The French prisoners were sure that he was no more a doctor than he was a captain of a Flying Fortress, but they acknowledged the skill with which he took care of himself. Every evening he was mobbed by news hungry inmates: the *Revier* was supposed to be the only place from which reliable news came. Besides, in spite of his reputation for talking big, Johnny was listened to seriously when he spoke about events in the war. One evening he came back with the story of revolution in Berlin; another evening with the revolt of the troops on the Eastern front; a third time with the landing of the Allies at Ostende; a fourth with the

International Red Cross taking all of the concentration camps over. Johnny was never short of good news, with the result that every evening, in February 1944, the war was going to be over in two months. He exhausted my patience, and that of others, too. To those who came up to me with the assurance that had been fed to them by Johnny, I was in the habit of answering that as far as I was concerned, I did not think that the war would be over for another two years. Moreover, since I was one of the very few who did not believe in the fall of Stalingrad, just on the face of things as it were, and I admitted it after it happened, I was immediately pigeonholed as a pessimist. In fact, I listened to everything with unshakable skepticism: the most refined horrors that were told about the history of the camps; the optimistic assumptions about the future conduct of the S.S. who felt, it was said, the wind of defeat blowing over Germany and who wanted to redeem themselves in the eyes of the coming conquerors; and the reassuring rumors about our ultimate assignment. I did not even fly in the face of facts. For example, the famous inscription which was on the wrought iron gate which closed the entry to the camp read: *Jedem das Seine*. With my little knowledge of the German language, I translated it as *A chacun sa destinée* (To each his destiny.) All of the French prisoners were convinced that it was a translation of the celebrated phrase which Dante had put on the gate to Hell: *Vous qui entrez ici abandonnez tout espoir* (2). That was the limit, and I the nonbeliever.

* * * *

The Block was divided into two antagonistic groups: on one side were the newly arrived prisoners, and on the other side were the eleven individuals - Block Chief, Secretary, Barber, and *Stubendienst*, German or Slav -who constituted its administrative backbone. There was a sort of solidarity which eliminated all of the differences of background or ideology, and yet bound together the first in reprobation against the second. The latter, prisoners like ourselves, but for a much longer time, knew all of the dodges of prison life, acted as though they were our actual masters, and controlled us with abuse, threats, and beatings. It was impossible for us not to consider them to be *agents provocateurs* or sycophants of the S.S. I saw at last what the *Chaouchs* - the prisoner trustees who are referred to in French literature about penitentiaries of all kinds-really were. From morning to night, our *Chaouchs*, throwing out their chests, plumed themselves on the power that they said that they had to send us to the *Krematorium* for the least indiscretion and with a single word. Also from morning to night, they ate what they stole, to our certain knowledge, from our rations: quarts of soup, bread and margarine, and potatoes fricasseed with onion or paprika. Moreover, they did not work. They were fat. They revolted us. Among these fellows I met Jircszah.

Jircszah was a Czech and a lawyer. Before the war he had been the assistant Mayor of Prague. The first thing that the Germans did when they occupied Czechoslovakia, was to arrest and deport him. He had been moved from camp to camp for four years. He knew them all: Auschwitz, Mauthausen, Dachau, Oranienburg. A commonplace accident had brought him to Buchenwald, among a transport of the sick. When he arrived, one of his compatriots got him the job of general interpreter for the Slavs. He hoped to be able to hold that position until the end of the war which he did not think was very near, but which he felt would come finally. He lived with the *Chaouchs* of Block 48, who considered him to be one of themselves, but his attitude immediately set him apart from the others and made us consider him to be one of us; among other things, he was more generous with the rations that he distributed, and he got hold of and lent us books.

With our arrival in the camp, Jircszah came into contact for the first time with Frenchmen. He looked at us with curiosity and with pity, too. So that's what the French are? So that's the culture they told him so much about when he was a student? He was disappointed; he couldn't get over it.

My skepticism and the way I kept myself apart from the noisy life of the Block drew him to me. "Is that what it is, the Resistance?" he asked. I did not answer. To reconcile him to France I introduced him to Crémieux.

He certainly did not approve of the conduct of the *Chaouchs*, but he was no longer shocked, and he did not even despise them. "I have seen worse," he said. "You mustn't expect men to have too much imagination along lines of what is right; when a slave gets power without changing his station, he becomes more tyrannical than the tyrants."

He told me the story of Buchenwald and the other camps. "There is a lot that is true in all that is said about the horrors for which they are the setting, but there is a lot of exaggeration, too. You have to reckon with the complex of Ulysses' lie, which is everyone's, and so it is with all of the internees. Human beings need to exaggerate the

bad as well as the good and the ugly as well as the beautiful. Everyone hopes and wants to come out of this business with the halo of a saint, a hero, or a martyr, and each one embroiders his own Odyssey without realizing that the reality is quite enough in itself."

He did not hate the Germans. To his mind, concentration camps were not specifically German and did not reveal propensities that were unique to the German people. "The camps -- *Les Lager*," as he said, "are an historical and social phenomenon through which all peoples go as they reach the idea of Nation and State. They were known in Antiquity, the Middle Ages, and in modern times. Why should the contemporary epoch be different? Long before the birth of Jesus Christ, the Egyptians could find no other way than this to neutralize the commercial threat that was presented by the Jews, and Babylon reached its marvelous apogee thanks to persons in concentration camps. The English, themselves, resorted to them with the unfortunate Boers, after Napoleon who invented Lambessa. As a matter of fact there are some in Russia which are nothing to be envied when they are compared to the German ones. Moreover, they exist in Spain, in Italy, and even in France (3); you will come across Spaniards here and you will see what they have to say about camp Gurs, in France, for example, where they were stuck right after Franco's triumph."

I ventured a remark. "In France, all the same, it is done out of humanity." In response, Jirsczah, countered: "The Germans, when they speak of the institution, use the word *Schutzhaftlager*, which means 'camp for protected prisoners.' When the Nationalist Socialists came to power, they decided, in a gesture of compassion, to put all of their adversaries in a place where they could not hurt the new regime and where they could be protected from the public anger. In other words, the National Socialists wanted to put an end to assassinations and to beatings on street corners and, at the same time, wanted to rehabilitate the strayed sheep and to bring them back to a healthier concept of the German community, of its destiny, and of the role that the individual was to play within it. But, National Socialism was overtaken by events and, particularly, by its agents. It is something like the story of the eclipse of the moon that is told in the barracks. The Colonel says one day to his Adjutant that there will be an eclipse of the moon and that the officers and noncoms should see to it that the soldiers see the phenomenon and that they have it explained to them. The adjutant then passed the word on to the Captain, who, in turn, passed it on down the ranks, and the news got to the soldiers via the Corporal in this form: 'By order of the Colonel, there will be an eclipse of the moon this evening at 23:00; all those not present will get four days guard duty.' And, so it is in the concentration camps: the ruling powers within the National Socialist regime thought them up and, then, set up regulations by which former unemployed illiterates run them through the assistance of *Chaouchs* who are selected from among us. In France, the democratic government of Daladier had established the camp at Gurs and had fixed the regulations for its operation, with the result being much the same as that that is found in the German camps. The implementation of those regulations was delegated to gendarmes and to militia whose power to interpret them was very limited.

"It is Christianity which introduced into Roman law the humanitarian nature that is given to punishment in the West and which assigned to it, as its first objective, the rehabilitation of the delinquent. But, Christianity failed to account for human nature, which cannot come to terms with itself, except on a basis of perversity. Believe me,

there are three kinds of people who have remained the same throughout all of recorded history: policemen, priests, and soldiers. Here, we have to deal with policemen."

Obviously, here it was a matter of policemen. I never had had any trouble with any other than the German police, but I had often read and heard it said that the French policemen do not distinguish themselves for any special consideration. I remember that at this moment in my conversation with Jircsah, I brought up the Almazian affair. But, Almazian was involved in a crime of common law, and we were political prisoners. The Germans did not seem to distinguish between common prisoners and political prisoners, and this fact accounted for the commingling of the two groups in the camps....

"Come, come," Jircsah said, "You seem to forget that it was a Frenchman, an intellectual of whom France is proud, a fine scholar, a great philosopher, Anatole France, who wrote: 'I am a supporter of the suppression of the death penalty in a matter of common law and of its reinstitution in political law.'"

By the end of the quarantine - since the S.S. never meddled with the camp life itself, which thus seemed to be left the master of its own laws and rules - I believed that Jircsah was more or less right; the National Socialists had resorted to this classic method of coercion, and it was the prisoners themselves who had made it still worse.

We hashed over other problems together, especially the war and the postwar period. Jircsah was middle class, a democrat, and a pacifist. "The last war left the world divided into three rival blocks," he said. "The Anglo-Americans, the traditional capitalists, the Soviets, and the Germans, the latter supported by Italy and Japan. There is one too many. The postwar period will find a world divided in two, and the democracies will make no headway and the peace will be no less precarious. The Allies think that they are fighting for liberty and that the Golden Age will rise from the ashes of Hitler. It will be terrible afterwards; the same problems will lie before two powers instead of three in a world that will be ruined materially and morally. Bertrand Russell was right when he said during his courageous youth, 'No ill that war claims to do away with is as bad as war itself.'" I shared that view, and even cherished it. As time went on, I thought often of Jircsah.

* * * *

It was March 10th, at about three o'clock. An officer of the S.S. entered the Block and shouted, "*Raus, los! Raus, raus!!*" (Everybody out. Out!) We began to assemble in the yard. We were going to leave, and the formalities were about to begin. For about a week, a rumor about this move had been going around, and guesses ran riot: to Dora, some said; to Cologne to clear up the rubble from the bombings and to salvage what could still be used, said the others. The latter guess carried the day. Those well-informed persons felt that the National Socialists - seeing that the war was lost - were abandoning the Kommando at Dora, considered to be the hell of Buchenwald, and were not sending anyone there any more. They added that, even though given the dangerous work of clearing ruins, we would be well treated at Cologne. Maybe we would run the risk of setting off an unexploded bomb at any moment, but we would get all that we wanted to eat; first, we would receive the camp ration; then, we could

have whatever we might find in the cellars, some of which would certainly be full of food supplies.

We did not know what Dora was. Not one of those prisoners who had been sent there had ever returned as far as we knew. It was said to be an underground factory, constantly being enlarged, in which secret weapons were being manufactured. One lived there, ate there, slept there, and worked there without ever seeing the light of day. Every day trucks brought full loads of dead bodies from Dora to be cremated at Buchenwald, and it was from the presence of these corpses that the horrors of the camp were deduced. Fortunately, we were not going there.

Four o'clock: we were still standing in front of the Block at attention (*Stillgestanden*) under the eyes of the S.S. guards. The Block Chief went down the ranks and the old men, the cripples, and the Jews were taken out. Crémieux who filled all three of these categories by himself, was one of them. The little cripple as well as a few others who did not seem to be either old men cripples, or Jews but whom we knew were in the good graces of the Block Chief since they passed for or actually were Communists--was also removed.

Half past four: we were marched to the infirmary for a medical checkup -- "checkup" was just a figure of speech. An S.S. doctor who was smoking a huge cigar and who was flopped in an armchair conducted the examination, so to speak. We passed in front of him in a single file and, generally, he did not even bother to look up.

Five thirty: next we went to the *Effectenkammer*, where we were given clothing - striped trousers, jacket and coat -- and shoes (leather with wooden soles) to replace the wooden clogs which were not fit for labor.

Six thirty: we had to stand for a roll call which lasted until nine o' clock. After that, before we could go to bed we still had to sew our numbers on to the clothing that we had just been issued: the strips of cloth on which numbers had been stenciled had to be sewn on the left side chest on the jacket and coat, and on the right pocket of the trousers.

On March 11th reveille came at half past four and the roll-call lasted from five-thirty until six. Ah! those roll-calls! In March, in the cold whether, it rained or the wind blew, we had to stand for hours and hours being counted and re-counted! This last one was a general roll-call of all of those prisoners - regardless of the Block that they belonged to - who were destined for the transport, and it took place on the mustering ground in front of the guard tower.

At eleven o'clock we were given our ration of soup. Then at four o'clock there was another roll-call which lasted until six or seven; we lost track of how long it lasted.

On March 12th, we got up at the usual reveille, and the roll-call lasted from half past five until ten. Roll-call and again the roll-call. They wanted to drive us crazy. At three o'clock we left Block 48 for good, and, after a wait for some time on the grounds, we were sent to the Block where the movie theater was, where we spent the night, with the lucky ones sitting down and with the rest of us standing up.

The next morning, reveille was sounded at half past three, an hour earlier than usual. The guards led us under the tower where we waited, in the dark and in the cold, with nothing in our stomachs since the day before at eleven, to be loaded onto a train. It was sometime between seven and eight o'clock when we got into the cars.

The trip was uneventful. We had elbow room, and we talked mainly about where we were going. The train was going in a westerly direction. To Cologne, that was it. We were right! At about four o'clock, the train stopped in the middle of nowhere, at a sort of railroad switchyard, where, floundering in the mud and the snow, miserable men who were haggard and dirty, and who wore striped rags of the same kind as our new clothes, unloaded the cars, dug ditches and cleared away rubble. Men with brassards and numbers - who were well clothed and full of health -- pushed them on with threats, insults or the blows of truncheons. We were forbidden to speak to them. Passing next to them, if by chance they were out of eye and ear shot of the guards, we questioned them in as low a voice as possible: "Say, where are we?" "At Dora, old boy, haven't you finished . . . yet?" Fernand and I looked at each other. We had only with difficulty just come to believe the optimistic rumors about Cologne. Now, we felt terribly discouraged, our shoulders sagged, and we felt the shadow of death pass over us.

Footnotes

1 [Leon Blum was imprisoned at Buchenwald at about the same time that Professor Rassinier was there. Several interesting references to Blum's stay at Buchenwald are found in his biography by Louise Dalby. One of them confirms the camp rumors which Professor Rassinier mentions:

Occasionally visits to Blum were restricted and letters censored, but he suffered very little while in France. His quarters at Buchenwald were reasonably comfortable, but his diet was poor and contributed greatly to his ill health. He resented most of the restrictions on his privacy, and the annoyance of being disturbed every two hours as guards thoroughly inspected his quarters. He was allowed to take a servant to care for him, he was permitted a radio by which he could occasionally get the B.B.C. although this was forbidden, and he received most of the food parcels sent him.

(Louise Elliott Dalby, *Leon Blum*. New York: Yoseloff, 1963 pp. 418-419.)]

2 This phrase translates: "Abandon all hope ye who enter here." Immediately after my liberation, in May 1945, when I was still in Germany on my way home, I heard a talk over the radio by a deportee - Gandrey Retty, if my memory holds -who gave this translation. This is how tall stories are born.

3 [The fact should be noted that the United States also had its concentration camps during this period. Best known, in spite of the repeated efforts of the liberal establishment to sweep all memory of the matter under the rug, are the so-called "relocation camps" where Americans of Japanese ancestry were interned during World War Two. This sordid episode, although officially justified as being necessary in the interest of national security, seems to have had as its real impetus certain racial

and economic motives. Clearly, the relocation of the prosperous Japanese-American community away from the West Coast afforded numerous bargain conscious Californians, among others, the opportunity of purchasing Nisei and Issei businesses and properties at "fire sale" prices, a fact which, without doubt, was on the minds of many of those persons who applauded the prompt action of General John DeWitt. For a general discussion of these "relocation camps," see, Allan R. Bosworth *America's Concentration Camps* (New York: W.W. Norton, 1967). Not so well known are the numerous concentration camps that were spread across the United States from the Carolinas to the Dakotas where German and Italian nationals many of whom had been long time residents of the U.S. were incarcerated. Following the outbreak of formal hostilities in December 1941, these German and Italian nationals were declared to be "enemy aliens", were rounded-up by the American version of the Gestapo, i.e., the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and were confined behind barbed wire for the duration of the war.]

Chapter Three

The Circles of Hell

On June 30, 1937, Buchenwald was only what its name means, a forest of beech trees, a place perched on a foot hill of the Harz mountains, five and a half miles from Weimar. One reached it by a stony, winding path. One day some men came by car to the foot of the hill. They climbed to the top on foot, as though it were an excursion. They carefully inspected the area. One of them pointed out a clearing; then they returned after having had a good luncheon at Weimar. "*Unser Führer wird zufrieden werden*," they said. (Our Führer will be pleased).

Sometime later others came. They were chained together by fives, one to the other and constituted a detachment of a hundred men, surrounded by about twenty S.S., guns in hand. There was no more room in the German prisons. They climbed up the path as best they could, sworn at and kicked. When they reached the top exhausted, they were put to work without any delay. A group of fifty put up tents for the S.S., while the other group put in place a circle of barbed wire, three Strands high and about a hundred circle of barbed wire, three strands high and about a hundred yards in diameter. The first day that was all that could be done. They ate a meagre meal in a hurry and almost without stopping work and, very late in the evening, they went to sleep right on the ground, wrapped in thin coverings. The next day, the first group of fifty unloaded all day long construction materials and sections of wooden barracks which heavy tractors managed to bring about half way up the hill; they carried this material the rest of the way up on their back s and placed it inside the barbed wire. The second group cut down trees to clear the area. They did not eat that day because they had started off in the first place with food for one day only. But, they slept better that night in the shelter of the branches and among the piles of boards.

Beginning with the third day, sections of barracks began to arrive at a faster rate and began to pile up half way up the hill. There were also a kitchen outfit, quantities of striped clothing, some tools, and some supplies. The S.S stated in their daily report that with one hundred men they could not keep up with material delivered. Others were sent them. The rations then were insufficient. At the end of the week, some fifty S.S. struggled with about a thousand prisoners who they did not know where to put at night, who they could barely feed and who overwhelmed their ability to supervise. The prisoners were made up into several groups or *Kommandos*, each detailed to a particular job: the kitchen for the S.S., the orderlies for their camp, the kitchen of the prisoners, the construction of the barracks, the transport of material, the administration accounting. All of these operations were called .SS *Küche*, *Häftlingsküche*, *Barrakenkommando Bauleitung*, *Arbeitsstatistik*, etc., and on paper, in reports, it looked like a simple and methodical organization. But it was in fact, a complete mess, a horrible swarming of men, who went through the motion of eating,

who worked haphazardly, and who barely slept covered in a jumble of branches and boards. Since it was easier to keep them under surveillance when they were working than when they were sleeping, the days were twelve, fourteen or sixteen hours long. Since there were not enough guards, they were forced to select a complement of trustees out of the whole lot of the prisoners on appearances alone, who, since they had uneasy consciences, created a reign of terror by way of excusing and justifying themselves. Blows rained, not just insults and threats.

The bad treatment, the poor and insufficient food, superhuman work, the lack of medicines, and the pneumonia created conditions that caused this gang of men to die at an alarming rate, endangering the general health. The S.S. had to think of another way to get rid of the bodies other than by burial which took too much time and which was too often repeated: so they had turned to cremation, a procedure that was much faster and in conformity with Germanic traditions. Another *Kommando*, in its turn, became indispensable, the *Totenkommando*, and the construction of a crematorium was put on the list of "urgent" work to be done. Thus it happened that a place was built for men to die in, before the place was built for them to live in. Everything is linked together: evil attracts evil, and when one is caught in the mesh of evil forces

Moreover, the camp was not conceived in the minds of the National-Socialist authorities to be just a camp, but a community working under supervision for the building of the Third Reich, just like the other individuals of the German community who remained in relative liberty. As a consequence, after the crematorium came the factory, the *Guzlow*. So it is seen that the order of precedence for all the installations was determined first by the need to keep everything well under guard, second by hygienic requirements, and third by the demands of work that constituted the *raison d'être* for the camp. Everything was subordinate to the collective interest which trampled down and crushed the individual.

Buchenwald was thus, during the period of the first installations, a *Straflager* (punishment camp) where only those considered incorrigible in other prisons were sent. Then, from the moment that the factory, the *Guzlow*, was ready to go, an *Arbeitslager* (labor camp) with *Strafkommandos*. Finally, it was transformed into a *Konzentrationslager* (concentration camp) which is what it was when we knew it, a camp equipped with all the amenities of a small city, where everyone was sent without discrimination. Around the central camp there were satellite camps, which it kept supplied with human material. All the camps went through these three stages successively. Unfortunately, with the war breaking out, prisoners from all places, of all kinds, in for all kinds of reasons, and under all kinds of disciplinary punishment, were haphazardly, because of the disorder of the circumstances, and indiscriminately sent to a *Straflager*, an *Arbeitslager*, or a [?]. The result was a frightening mixture of all kinds of humanity which resembled, under the sign of the truncheon, a gigantic basket of crabs, over which National-Socialism, so sure of itself and so methodical in its operations, but overwhelmed on all sides by events which were beginning to master it, threw an immense Noah's mantel.

Dora was born under the sponsorship of Buchenwald and in the same way. It grew and prospered following the same process.

In 1903, German engineers and chemists had discovered that the stone of the Harz mountains in that area was rich in ammonia. Since no private company was willing to risk capital in its extraction, the Government undertook it. Germany did not possess as did her neighbors, colonies that were able to put at her disposal men from Cayenne or Nouméa. Because of this fact together with the fact that she was obliged to keep her convicts inside the country, they were imprisoned in certain places where they were used for especially disagreeable labor. As a consequence, a convict prison, like all convict prisons in the world except for a few minor differences, was created at Dora. In 1910, for reasons unknown, but most likely because the yield of ammonia was much smaller than was anticipated, quarrying the stone was stopped. It was resumed during the war of 1914-1918 as a sort of punitive camp for prisoners of war at a time when Germany was already beginning to think of going underground to escape some of the devastation of bombing. Again the operation was interrupted by the Armistice. Between the two wars, Dora was completely forgotten: wild tangled growth masked the entrance to the excavations and, all around, vast fields of sugar-beets were cultivated to supply the sugar refinery at Nordhausen three and a half miles away.

It was into these beet fields that on September 1, 1943, Buchenwald disgorged a first well escorted *Kommando* of two hundred men. Germany, again feeling the need to go underground or at least to put her war industries underground, had taken up the project of 1915 again. Construction of the S.S. camp and of the crematorium was begun, underground the factory was set up, and the kitchens, showers, the *Arbeitsstatistik*, the *Revier*, or infirmary, were built, last of all. So long as the underground work existed, the S.S. delayed as long as possible, putting off always a little longer, the unprofitable work of constructing Blocks for the prisoners, preferring instead to dig the gallery of the tunnel farther in, and to make it possible to get as many factories as possible under protection from the ever increasing threats from the open sky.

When we arrived at Dora, the camp was still in the *Straflager* stage. We made an *Arbeitslager* out of it. When we left it with its 170 Blocks, its infirmary, its theater, its brothel, and with all its installations in place and its tunnel completed, it was on the point of becoming a *Konzentrationslager*. Already, at the other end of the double tunnel, there was another camp, Ellrich, its offspring, and which was itself in the *Straflager* stage. There could be no break in the descending curve of human misery.

But, the English and Americans and the Russians had decided otherwise, and, on April 11, 1945, they came to free us. Since then, the penitentiary system of East Germany has been in the hands of the Russians who haven't changed things a fraction. Tomorrow, it will be in the hands of ... who knows? Since there must be no gap in history.

* * * *

A concentration camp, when it is completely set up, is a regular city which is isolated from the outside world which conceived it, which is surrounded by fences of electrified barbed wire, and which is guarded with special guards every fifty yards on platforms, armed to the teeth. To make the screen between the two even more dense,

an S.S. garrison bordered the camp and at a distance of three or four miles all around sentinels were encamped. Thus, anyone trying to escape would have a certain number of obstacles to overcome, or perhaps it would be better to say that any attempt would be doomed to failure. This isolated city had its own laws and its own particular social phenomena. Any ideas born there, individually or collectively, were stopped at the barbed wire and remained unsuspected by the rest of the world. By the same token, almost everything that took place in the outer world, was unknown on the inside, any penetration being made almost impossible by that screen (1). Newspapers came in; but, they were carefully selected and said nothing but those things that had been especially printed for the inmates in the concentration camp. It did happen in wartime that the "news" for the concentration camp inmates was the same as that which the Germans were supposed to take as gospel, and that is why the but those things that had been especially printed for the inmates in the concentration camp. It did happen in wartime that the "news" for the concentration camp inmates was the same as that which the Germans were supposed to take as gospel, and that is why the newspapers were the same for both, but it was pure chance. Use of the radio was punishable. It follows that camp life, organized on other moral and sociological principles, had quite a different orientation from that of normal life. As a consequence, it revealed aspects that could not be judged by standards common to mankind in general. But, it was a city, and a human city.

Inside -- or on the outside, but near by -- a factory was the reason for its existence and its means of existence: at Buchenwald, the *Guzlow*; at Dora, the Tunnel. The factory was the keystone of the entire edifice, and its needs, which had to be satisfied, were the iron laws. The camp was made for the factory, and not the factory to keep the camp busy.

The most important department of the camp was the *Arbeitsstatistik*, which kept a strict accounting of the entire population, and kept track of each man day after day in his work. At the *Arbeitsstatistik* the personnel could tell you at any moment whatsoever of the day what each prisoner was doing and where he could be found. This department, like all the others, too, was entrusted to prisoner trustees and kept busy a considerable and privileged number of them.

Then came the *Politische-Abteilung*, which kept track of the political aspects of the camp and which was able to give for any prisoner any information wanted about his previous life, his moral conduct, the reasons for his arrest... It was the department of anthropometry of the camp, its *Sicherheitsdienst* (security police), and employed only those prisoners in whom the S.S. had confidence. Once again the privileged.

Then the *Verwaltung*, or the general administration, which kept track of everything that came into the camp: food, material, clothing, etc.... It was the quartermaster of the camp. Those prisoners employed in office work always occupied a privileged position.

These three big departments ran the camp. They had at their head a *Kapo* who ran them under the supervision of a noncommissioned officer of the S.S., or *Rapportführer*. There was a *Rapportführer* for all the key services, and each one of them reported every evening to the *Rapportführer-general* of the camp. who was an officer, generally an *Oberleutnant*. This *Rapportführer-general* communicated with

the prison camp through the intermediary of his subordinates and of the *Lagerältester*, or the doyen of the prisoners, who was responsible in general for the camp and who answered for its smooth running even with his life.

Similarly, the departments of the second level: the *Sanitätsdienst*, or health service, which included doctors, male nurses disinfection, infirmary and crematorium services; the *Lagerschutzpolizei*, or camp police; the *Feuerwerk*, or fire protection; the *Bunker*, or jail for those prisoners caught breaking the rules of the camp; the *Kino-Theater*, or movie, and the brothel, or *Pouf*.

There were also the *Küche*, or kitchen; the *Effektenkammer*, or clothing store, which was attached to the *Verwaltung*; the *Häftlingskantine*, or canteen, which supplied the prisoners with extra food and drinks in exchange for the coin of the realm, the *Bank*, where the special money good only in the camp was issued .

And, now to describe the mass of workers... They were divided up into Blocks constructed on the same plan as that of Buchenwald 48, but of wood, and with only one floor. They lived there only at night. They returned there at night after roll call at about nine o'clock, and they left every morning before dawn, at half past four. They were supervised by the Block Chiefs who were surrounded by their *Schreiber*, *Friseur*, *Stubendienst*, who were veritable satraps. The Block Chief governed life in the Block through the supervision of an S.S. soldier, or *Blockführer*, who reported to the *Rapportführer-general*. The *Blockführer* were only rarely seen; generally they confined themselves to one friendly visit with the Block Chief during the day, that is, when the prisoners were away, so that it was the latter who was in effect the only authority, and practically all of his exactions were without appeal.

During the day, that is, during the period of actual work, the prisoners were caught in the meshes of another group of prisoner trustees and camp officials. Every morning those who worked only during the day were divided up among *Kommandos*, each with a *Kapo* for chief, assisted by one, two or several foremen or *Vorarbeiter*. Each day, beginning at four thirty, the *Kapos* and the *Vorarbeiter* were at the mustering grounds, in a designated place -- always the same, and formed their respective *Kommandos* which they conducted in marching time to the place where they were to work. There a *Meister* or a civilian supervisor informed them of the job that they were to have their men get done during the day. The *Kommandos* which were used by the factory did two twelve hour shifts rather than the usual three eight hour shifts. They were divided into two teams or *Schicht*: There was the *Tageschicht* which came before the *Kapos* and *Vorarbeiter* at nine o'clock in the morning, and the *Nachtschicht* at nine o'clock in the evening. The two *Schicht* alternated one week of day labor and one week of night labor.

That was the Buchenwald which we knew. Life was bearable there for the prisoners who definitely were assigned to the camp; it was a little harder for those who were destined to stay there only for the quarantine period. It must have been the same in all of the camps. Unhappily, when mass deportations of foreigners into Germany were taking place, few camps were ready, aside from Buchenwald, Dachau, and Auschwitz. Consequently, almost all of the deportees knew the camps only during their construction, as *Straflager*, and *Arbeitslager*. but not *Konzentrationslager*. Unhappily, too, even in camps that were ready, all responsibilities were given to German

prisoners at first, to facilitate relations between the *Häftling* people and those of the *Führung*, and to the survivors of the *Straflagers* and the *Arbeitslagers* afterward, who could not imagine the *Konzett*, as they called it, without the horrors that they had themselves suffered there. This latter group constituted a much greater obstacle to any humanizing of the camps than did the S.S. The "Do not do unto others what you do not want others to do unto you" is a concept of another world, which had no meaning in the concentration camp. "Do unto others what has been done to you" was the motto of all the *Kapos*, who had spent years and years in *Straflagers* and *Arbeitslagers*, and in whose minds the horrors that they had lived through had created a tradition, which, by an understandable distortion, they felt obliged to perpetuate. If by chance the S.S. forgot to mistreat us, these prisoners took care to make up for the slip.

* * * * *

The population of the camp, its social composition, and its origins were also elements that were de-humanizing. I have already remarked that National-Socialism drew no distinctions between political crime and common crime, and that consequently, there was in Germany no distinction between the civil and the political regime. As in the prisons of most civilized nations, there was something of everything in the camps -- of everything and something else besides. All of the prisoners, whatever social or criminal element they came from, lived together, under the same regulations. The only thing that distinguished them was the colored triangle on their prison clothing which was the insignia of their classification -- i.e., their reason for being there.

Red was reserved for political crimes. For common crimes, there was a green triangle; it was plain for *Verbrecher*, or petty crimes; it was embellished with an "S" for *Schwerverbrecher*, or serious crimes, and a "K" for *Kriegsverbrecher*, or war crimes. Thus, a gradation was made from common crimes, such as a simple theft, to murder and to the theft of supplies or armaments .

Between these two extremes, there was a whole series of intermediary crimes: the black triangle (professionally unemployed); the pink triangle (pederasts and homosexuals); the yellow triangle reversed over a red one so as to form a star (Jews); purple triangle (conscientious objectors) (2). In addition, those who had done a certain term in prison, and then, following their release, were incarcerated again for committing new crimes wore instead of the triangle a black circle on white background with a large "Z" in the center, which stood for those freed from the *Zuchthaus* or prison. And, finally, those who wore a red triangle with the point up had committed minor crimes in the army and had been sentenced by a court-martial.

To these were added a few special ones: the red triangle with a transverse bar for those sent to the *Konzett* for the second or third time; three black dots on a yellow and white brassard for the blind; the *Wifo*, the same circle as for the *Zuchthaus* people with the "Z" replaced by a "W." These latter had originally been volunteer workers. They had been employed by the *Wifo* firm which had been the first to try to achieve the *Vergeltungsfeurer* the famous V1 and V2 rockets. One fine day, and for no apparent reason, they got the striped clothes and were put into concentration camps. The secret of the V1 and V2 having gone through the trial period and into the intensive production stage was not to be freely circulated, even among the German people. In other words, they were interned for reasons of State security. The *Wifo*

were the most unfortunate ; people in the camp: they continued to be paid their salary, half of which was paid them in the camp itself, the rest being sent to their families. They had the right to keep their hair and to write whenever they wanted to, on condition that they said nothing about what had happened to them; and since they were the best off, they introduced the black market into the camp and raised the exchange (3).

As far as the population was concerned, the concentration camps were regular towers of Babel in which personalities clashed because of differences of origin, of their sentences, and previous social standing. The common law offenders hated the political criminals whom they didn't understand, and the latter returned the feeling. The intellectuals looked down on the manual laborers, and the latter rejoiced to see the former "working at last." The Russians wrapped the whole of the West in the same icy contempt. The Poles and the Czechs couldn't stand the French, because of Munich, etc... On the nationality level, there were enmities between Slavs and Germanic people, between the Germans and the Italians, between the Dutch and the Belgians, or between the Dutch and the Germans. The French, who came last and began to receive the most magnificent parcels of food, were looked down on by everybody except the Belgians, who were pleasant, frank, and good. France was regarded as a land of milk and honey, and her inhabitants as sybaritic degenerates, who were incapable of work, who ate well, and who were occupied only with making love. To these sentiments the Spaniards added the concentration camps of Daladier. I remember having been accosted in Block 24 at Dora by a vigorous: "Ah! The French; now you know what a *Lager* means. No harm, it'll teach you!"

It was one of the three Spaniards (there were 26 in all at Dora) who had been interned at Gurs in 1938, enrolled in labor companies in 1939, and sent to Buchenwald after Rethel. The three maintained that the only difference between the French and the German camps was the work; all other things, treatment, food, being just about the same. In fact they added that the French camps were dirtier.

Oh, Jircsah !

* * * * *

The S.S. guards lived in a parallel camp. In general, they were a company. At first, this company was a training unit for young recruits, and only Germans were in it. Later on, the S.S. became more international in composition: Italians, Poles. Czechs. Bulgarians, Rumanians, Greeks, among others filled the ranks (4). The necessities of war had compelled the Germans to send the young recruits to the front, often with limited military instruction, or even without any special preparation, and the young were replaced by the old, those who had already served in the war of 1914-1918, on whom National Socialism had made scarcely any imprint. They were less hard. In the last two years of the war, when there were not enough S.S., the rejects from the *Wehrmacht* and the *Luftwaffe*, who couldn't be used for anything else, were assigned as guards to the camps.

All the services of the camp had their parallel in the S.S. camp where everything was centralized, and from which daily or weekly reports were sent directly to Himmler's offices in Berlin. The S.S. camp was, therefore, the administrator of the other. When

the camps were just beginning during the *Straflager* period, they were administered directly: afterwards, and as soon as possible, the S.S. carried on the camp administration only through the prisoners themselves as intermediaries. One would think that this arrangement was used out of sadism and, after the war was over, that is what was said. But, it was really out of the necessity to economize personnel that the system was used, and for that reason, in all prisons in all countries, the same situation holds. The S.S. itself only administrated the camp when it was impossible for them to do otherwise. We knew what self-government by the prisoners in the camps was. All of the old hands who have experienced both systems are unanimous in recognizing that the former was in principle the better and the more humane, and that if it was not in tact, it was because wartime circumstances and the pressure of events did not permit it. I believe it; it is better to deal with God than with the saints.

So the S.S. guarded the perimeter of the camp, and it can be said that we hardly ever saw them inside the camp, except when they simply went through to take the salute of the prisoners, the famous "*Mützen ab*". They were helped in their guard duty by a company of marvelously trained dogs, always ready to bite and capable of hunting out an escaped prisoner tens of miles away. Every morning, the *Kommandos* that were to work outside the camp, often they traveled three or four miles on foot -- when they had to go farther, they used trucks or trains -- were accompanied, according to their importance, by two or four S.S., guns in hand, each with a muzzled dog on a leash. This special guard, which complemented the surveillance of the *Kapos*, just kept watch from afar, and did not intervene in supervision of the prisoners unless a show of force was called for.

In the evening, at the roll-call by Block, when everyone was there, at a whistle, all the *Blockführer* turned toward the Block for which they were responsible, counted those present, and then went back to report. During this operation non-coms went around the Blocks to enforce silence and attention. The *Kapos*, Block Chiefs, and *Lagerschutz* (5) greatly helped them in making this task easy. From time to time an S.S. man stood out from the others for his brutality, but it was rare; and in no case was he ever more inhuman than the prisoner trustees who filled the positions that are mentioned in the preceding sentence .

* * * * *

The problem of the *Häftlingsführung* dominated the life of the concentration camps, and the way it was handled determined their evolution in so far as the welfare of the common prisoners was concerned.

At the inception of every camp there was no *Häftlingsführung* (6) ; there just the convoy of prisoners which arrived out in the open, guarded by the S.S. who themselves assumed all responsibility, directly and in detail. And that's the way it remained until the second, third, or fourth convoy arrived. The direct supervision of the S.S. could last six weeks, two months, six months, a year. But, as soon as a camp grew to a certain size, since the number of S.S. personnel could not be indefinitely expanded, they were obliged to take from among the prisoners the additional manpower necessary to keep watch over the mass of prisoners. One has to have experienced concentration camp life and have assimilated their history really to understand this phenomenon and the form it took in practice.

When the camps were originated in 1933, the German state of mind was such that opponents of National Socialism were considered the worst of brigands. With this attitude in the popular mind, the new masters easily succeeded in indoctrinating the masses to accept the idea that there were no crimes or offenses against common rights or political rights but only and simply crimes and offenses. As a result, the distinction between the two became unclear and in many instances it took very little to make the second, to all appearances more odious than the first in the eyes of a youthful fanatic, enrolled in the S.S. and entrusted with carrying out the project! Now put yourself in the place of the fifty S.S. soldiers at Buchenwald, on the day when, deluged by a thousand prisoners and a huge mass of materiel they had to select the first trustees from among their prisoners, and appoint the first *Lagerältester*. Between a Thaelmann or a Breitscheid, whose recalcitrance was especially brought to their attention, and the first criminal they came across who had murdered his mother-in-law or raped his sister, but who was just as dull and docile as you please, they did not hesitate; they chose the second. He, in his turn, appointed the *Kapos* and the *Blockältester*, and naturally he picked them from his kind of people, that is, from the common criminal, the "greens."

It was only after the camps had developed up to a certain point that they became real ethnographic and industrial centers, and that men of some moral and intellectual caliber were really needed to give efficacious assistance to the *S.S.-Führung*. The latter perceived that the common criminals were the dregs of the population, in the camp as elsewhere, and that they were quite beneath what was required of them. Then the S.S. turned for help to the political criminals. One day a "green" *Lagerältester* had to be replaced by a "red," who at once began to get rid of the "greens" in all positions, in favor of the "reds." And so arose the struggle which rapidly became a permanent one between the "greens" and the "reds." And, that explains why old camps like Buchenwald and Dachau were in the hands of the Politicals when we were there (7) while the newer ones, still at the *Straflager* or *Arbeitslager* stage except for miraculous variations, were always in the hands of the "greens."

An attempt has been made to claim that the struggle between the "greens" and the "reds", which only very late in the day extended beyond the German contingent in the camps, was the result of a coordinated effort on the part of the second against the first: this assertion is incorrect. The politicals, distrusting each other, not knowing where to turn, had only very vague and tenuous solidarity among themselves. But, on the side of the "greens," it was quite different: they formed a compact block, firmly held together by that instinctive confidence which always exists among criminals, recidivists and convicts. The triumph of the "reds" was due only to chance, to the incompetence of the "greens," and to the discernment of the S.S.

It was also said that the political -- and especially the German political -- had organized revolutionary committees, had held meetings in the camps, had stocked arms, and had secret correspondents on the outside. This is pure legend. It is possible that some happy concurrence of circumstances made it possible, on occasion, for an individual to write to the outside, or to another prisoner in another camp, under the nose of the S.S.-Führung. Or, someone who was released from a camp might carry, with great precaution, news from a prisoner to his family or a political friend; maybe someone who had just arrived might do the same thing in reverse. In fact, a transport of prisoners sometimes became a means of communication from one camp to another.

But it was extremely rare, at least during the war, for a prisoner to be discharged from a camp and, as for the transports, no one in the camp, not even most of the S.S., knew what their destination was to be before they got there. Generally one only learned that a transport had taken place several weeks or months after its departure, and that it had arrived at Dora or Ellrich, through the sick, who sometimes came back from them. More often, this information was learned through the dead, who were returned to the camp to be cremated, and on whose chests their numbers and places of origin could be seen. But to say that these communications were premeditated, organized, and carried through, is pure fantasy. As for the stocking of arms: in the final days of Buchenwald, thanks to the chaos, some of the prisoners were able to filch pieces of guns, and even whole weapons from the manufacturing that was going on, but to state that such activity was a systematic practice is ridiculous. And, as for the revolutionary committees, and the meetings held: I had a good laugh, when, after the liberation, I heard of a committee for French interests at Buchenwald being talked about. Three or four vociferous Communists, including Marcel Paul (8) and the famous Colonel Manhes who had managed to escape from the evacuation transports, evoked this committee in the vacuum between the departure of the S.S. and the arrival of the Americans. They succeeded in making others believe that this committee had long been organized (9), but the existence of this committee is a pure invention and the Americans did not take it seriously. Their first action, when they came into the camp, was to ask the trouble-makers to be quiet and the crowd that was getting ready to listen to them to go back quietly to the Blocks. In short, everybody was required to submit from the start to a discipline of which they alone intended to remain the masters. After order was restored, they took care of the sick, the feeding of the prisoners, and the organization of the repatriation efforts, without taking any notice of the advice and suggestions which the several last minute VIP's tried in vain to impress upon them. And, that was all to the good: it cost Marcel Paul a lesson in humility, and a certain number of lives were saved.

Finally, it was said that the politicals, when they had the upper hand in the *H-Führung* were more human than the common criminals. And this claim was said to be supported by the experience at Buchenwald (10). It is true that Buchenwald was, when we arrived there, a relatively comfortable camp for those prisoners who were definitely free of any threat of being transported to any of the satellite camps. But, the bearable situation at Buchenwald was due more to the fact that it had completed its evolution and had become a *Konzentrationslager*, than because it had a political *H-Führung*. In the other camps which were behind it in development, the distinctions between the "greens" and the "reds" were hardly discernible. It could have been that contact with the politicals might have improved the moral standards of the criminals; but, the opposite took place, and it was the criminals who corrupted the politicals.

Footnotes

(1) It is said that the German population was almost totally ignorant of what went on in the camps during the war, and I believe it. In fact, the SS personnel who lived near the camps and who guarded their perimeters were, for the most part, ignorant of -- or, at least, did not learn of -- certain happenings until long after they were past.. If the reader finds this contention hard to believe, permit me to ask the following question:

who in France knows any of the details about the life of the prisoners at French penal institutions at Carrere, La Noe, and other places? [And, for the American reader: how many Americans really know what goes on in the thousands of jails, penitentiaries, and prison farms that exist throughout the United States?]

(2) [For a scathing description by an English prisoner of the Jews -- as well as others - who were interned at Buchenwald, see Christopher Burney, *The Dungeon Democracy* (New York: Duell, Sloan, & Pearce, 1946).]

(3) ["Black markets" seem to have been a common feature throughout the German concentration camp system. For a detailed discussion of how this kind of *sub rosa* economic activity worked in a German P.O.W. camp, see R. A. Radford, "The Economic organization of a P.O.W. Camp," *Economica*, (November 1945), pp. 189-201.]

(4) [By the end of the war, nationals of virtually every country in Europe -- including, even, Turkey -- were fighting along side the Germans. A kind of "pan-Europeanism" in the face of the possible annihilation of European culture at the hands of the Russians seems to have been a primary motivational factor for some of these volunteers. For a general discussion on the foreign volunteers from German occupied Europe who fought on the German side -- generally in units of the *Waffen-SS* -- see David Littlejohn, *The Patriotic Traitors* (Garden City: Doubleday, 1972). As a general rule, most of the foreign volunteers fought in combat units on the Eastern Front against the Russians. Some, however, were assigned to other duties such as the guarding of concentration camps. Littlejohn mentions, for example, that while the bulk of the Dutch and Flemish SS volunteers were transferred to the *Waffen-SS* following June 22, 1941, some of them were retained in Holland where, among other things, they guarded the concentration camps at Westerbork, Vught, and Amersfoort (p. 99).]

(5) All of these administrative positions within the camp were filled by prisoners who had been selected for the jobs by the SS guards.

(6) "*Häftlingsführung*" means the "self-government" or the direction of the day to day operation of the camp by the prisoners themselves.

(7) [Following the liberation of Buchenwald by American troops, a U.S. Army report was prepared in which it was stated that "... the prisoners themselves organized a deadly terror within the Nazi terror..." with German communist inmates running things. This report formed the basis of an article by a former U.S. Army officer who was present at Buchenwald following the capture of the camp and who interviewed many of the prisoners. In his article, he presents a story of how the communists ran the camp which corroborates many of the details which Professor Rassinier mentions in the text. Among other things, he says that "... on the day Buchenwald was liberated, the Army intelligence men were astounded to note that the 300 surviving German communities [who were running the camp from the inside] were dressed like 'prosperous business men.'" See, Donald B. Robinson, "The Communist Atrocities at Buchenwald," *American Mercury* (October, 1946), pp. 397-404. See, also, R.H.S. Crossman, "Buchenwald," *Nation* (July 30, 1945), pp. 123-125, in which the author

reports on an interview with an Austrian inmate who describes at length how the communists ran Buchenwald from the inside.]

(8) Marcel Paul was a *Stubendienst* in Block 56, and later he was assigned to Block 24 where the parcels that were sent to prisoners by their relatives were received.

(9) There was only one "committee" of long standing in the camps, and this "committee" was the loose association of thieves and pillagers, composed of either "reds" or "greens," who had been given the levers of command by the SS. At the liberation -- in order to save their own necks - they tried to put everyone off the track by claiming that they had represented organized prisoner resistance to the Germans, and to a large measure they have succeeded in this objective.

(10) Although to this camp was due all the notoriety about the "human skin lamp-shades" for which Ilse Koch, called the "Bitch of Buchenwald," today remains solely responsible, the question still remains: did the wife of the *Lagerkommandant* walk around the camp looking for handsome tattooing, and herself pointing out their unfortunate owners for death? I can neither confirm nor disprove it. Nevertheless, I can point out that from February through March 1944, rumors in the concentration camp accused the two *Kapos* of the *Steinbruch* and the *Gartnerei*, of that crime, already carried out by them, with the complicity of almost all their "colleagues." The two buddies had made a business of the death of tattooed prisoners, whose skins they sold to Ilse Koch in exchange for a variety of favors, and to others, through the intermediation of the *Kapo* and the SS of the Crematorium service. So, the contention of the accusation, if it has any basis in fact, is very fragile. [For a further discussion of the Ilse Koch matter, see Arthur R. Butz, *The Hoax of the Twentieth Century* (Richmond, Surrey: Historical Review Press [1976]), pp. 42-43.]

Chapter Four

Charon's Bark

We were received at Dora according to the customary routine: Out of the rail cars, a frantic race across the rubble, in the mud up to the ankles, under melting snow, insults, shouted threats, barking, blows.

Across the *S.S.-Lager*, about fifty buildings were spread around, with no paved walks going from one to the other; just muddy paths through fields.

Entrance to the *H-Lager*: two blocks of wooden buildings, one on each side of a wire tangle that opened in front of us. We were counted. "*Zu fünf ! Zu fünf ! Mensch Blöder Hund!*" Wham, a blow from [?] a fist. Wham, a kick.

On the other side of the wire fence was the camp itself. Ten or so square blocks of wooden buildings, a dozen at the most, were laid out haphazardly with no visible coordination. On the way we could read from a distance the numbers on the Blocks: 4, 35, 104, 17. Where are the other Blocks?

A muddy track, marked out by many tramping feet, led away from the entrance and climbed the hill, with nothing to indicate that it led anywhere. The guards had us take it and we came to the *gemeinde Abort* (public toilet) where we were penned in, waiting for orders. The *gemeinde Abort* was a Block in which there were only toilets, urinals, and wash basins. It was impossible to sit down or to stretch out, and going outside was forbidden. We were tired and famished, too. Toward six o'clock, a bowl of soup, 300 grams of bread, a piece of margarine and a slice of sausage were served to us. We noticed that the rations were ampler than at Buchenwald. A breath of optimism blew over us. "We shall be working, but at least we shall eat" was whispered among the group.

Men with brassards appeared at eight o'clock: a table was set up; a clerk sat down. One by one we passed in front of the table where we stated our registration number, name, and profession. The men with brassards were Czechs and Poles who had been interned for a variety of offenses. They were heavy handed and made generous use of the rubber truncheons with which they were armed. "*Hier ist Dora! Mensch! Blöder Hund!*" and wham, wham.

At midnight, the business was finished. Everyone was ordered outside. We retraced our path, in the dark this time, always surrounded by *Kapos* and S.S. Suddenly we found ourselves in front of an immense excavation which opened on the hill side: the Tunnel. Two enormous iron folding doors opened: this was it, we were going to be buried; nobody had any idea that these iron doors would ever open again to liberate us. The horrors that we had heard about this "underground" installation while we were at Buchenwald worried us.

We entered the Tunnel and were confronted with a Dantesque scene: outside, all was darkness; inside we were in full light. Two parallel railroad tracks were set a yard apart; so trains shuttled back and forth in the belly of the monster? A string of cars loaded and covered with tarpaulin shrouded torpedo shapes, immense shells longer than the cars which carried them, was sitting on one of the tracks. They were the famous V1 and V2 rockets. By their looks, their diameter was greater than a man's height, and they appeared to be more than 40 feet long. "That must have quite an effect where it falls!"

Talk started to turn to the mechanical details and the launching method of the V1 and V2 which we had heard about and which we saw now for the first time. To my great amazement, I found that there were some persons among us who seemed to be very well informed, and who with the greatest seriousness provided the most precise details, but who later turned out to be the most fanciful story-tellers.

We kept going farther inside. On each side of the main tunnel were offices and caverns that had been fixed up as work shops. We came to a portion of the Tunnel which was still being worked on: gaunt, thin, diaphanous shadows of men perched on scaffolding all over, against the walls like bats, were boring into the rock. On the ground, the S.S. guards walked around, guns in hand; the *Kapos*, in all the coming and going, bawled out the poor men who were carrying tools or were pushing wheel barrows full of the excavated material. The noise of machinery was deafening, and dead bodies were sprawled along the passageways.

One cavern was fixed up as a living Block; we were ordered to stop.

At the entrance were two garbage cans and fifteen or so corpses. Inside, men were running around like madmen between the tiers of bunks, three, four and five layers. Brawls erupted between two or in a group now and then. Among them, serious and imposing, were the *Stubendienst* who tried in vain to restore order. That was where we were to spend the night. The *Stubendienst* interrupted their police work to take care of us. "*Los! Los! Mensch! Hier ist Dora!*" The rubber truncheons began to dance on their new targets. The Block Chief, a big German, looked on, amused, mocking, and threatening at the same time. We quickly saw that this Block was occupied by Russians whose day gang was off work. Still dressed we threw ourselves down on the straw pallets assigned to us. At last! Hours later, we woke up: all our shoes and what was left from the food distribution the evening before had disappeared. Even our pockets had been emptied. We admired the dexterity of the Russians who had accomplished this general pillage without waking us up. Only two or three were caught in the act. The victims took them to the Block Chief and were themselves brought back to their straw mattresses, with blows of the rubber truncheon, by their *Stubendienst* accomplices "*Hier ist Dora, mein Lieber!*" We had fallen for sure into the lair of brigands whose only law is that of the jungle.

As soon as we were awake, we were brought back up to the daylight. We breathed easier; so we were not to be buried indefinitely. The morning was spent standing in front of the *Arbeitsstatistik*, stamping around in the mud and the snow; we were freezing cold and hungry again. In the afternoon, we were divided up into *Kommandos*: Fernand and I were landed in the *Strassenbauer 52* (road builders).

Right away they put us to work, and until the evening roll-call we carried fir trees on the run, from the camp to the railway station.

At six o'clock, the roll-call: it lasted until half past eight. At nine o'clock we were ordered to Block 35. This time we were sure that we were not going to be put underground in the Tunnel. But, we learned that quite a few among us had claimed to be skilled in all kinds of specialized technical professions so that they would be employed in the factory and so that they would not have to come up again in all probability until the liberation.

The Chief of Block 35 was a Czech; the *Stubendienst*, too, naturally. The Block itself was still bare of furnishings. We slept piled together, right on the floor, without covers, in our clothes. But first, in an indescribable scuffle, they gave us a quart of rutabaga soup which we ate while standing; that was all we had to eat that day. At ten we went to sleep, certain now that we were an integral part of Dora. Dora!

* * * * *

The first day of work...

Half past four: a gong sounded four times in that shell of a camp. The Block lights went on, the *Stubendienst*, rubber club in hand, burst in to the *Schlafsaal*. "*Aufstehen! Aufstehen! Los Waschen!*" Then, with pause, "*Los, Mensch! Los, Waschen !*"

The two hundred men got up as one, crowded through the *Esszimmer*, bare to the waist, and in the passage between came to the door of the wash room at the same time as the two hundred from the other *Flügel*. The wash room could hold twenty persons. At the entrance two *Stubendienst*, hose nozzle in hand, held back the invasions. "*Langsam! Langsam!... Langsam, Lumme!*" At the same time the hose went into action. The poor fellows fell back... Meanwhile, two other *Stubendienst* having anticipated the water spray, forced them on:

"*Los.' Los.' Schnell, Mensch! Ich sage: waschen!*" And, the truncheons rained down pitilessly on the thin bare shoulders.

Every morning it was the same tragi-comedy. It didn't stop there, however. After washing came the distribution of food for the day. We went single file holding in hand the chit that had been handed out in the wash room (you could not get your food until you had shown that you had washed) and which had to be given to a *Stubendienst*. Another solid crush of humanity. The hour allowed by the rules to accomplish this double formality was soon over.

Half past five: the *Kapos*, warmly clothed, were there on the mustering ground waiting for the arrival of the human tide. It came pouring out toward them from all the Blocks; men running in the icy morning while still dressing and swallowing the last mouthful of the meager portion of the daily ration that had been handed out for breakfast. The *Kapos* proceeded with the assembling of the *Kommandos* and called the roll of their men blows and insults rained down. With the roll-call over, the *Kommandos* started out at a predetermined pace according to the distance they had to go; some had to go as far as three and a half to five miles, and they left first. Then

came those who had only an hour's march, and finally those with only half an hour's walk. *Kommando 52* was twenty minutes away. It left at six thirty. At exactly seven o'clock everyone was where he was to work. The Tunnel *Kommandos* were run on another schedule: reveille at seven in the morning for the day shift, seven in the evening for the night shift, and all of the preliminaries for the work took place in the Tunnel itself.

At seven o'clock *Kommando 52* was at the embankments, having arrived there after having completed the washing and the feeding operations, after having waited shivering in ten inches of mud at attention for an hour and ten minutes, and after having marched the mile and a quarter or so from camp to work. The men were already exhausted long before the work began.

The purpose of the work was to construct a road bed from the station to the camp. An ellipse of narrow-gauge railway track, whose greatest diameter was perhaps 800 yards, was used in the construction. Two trains of eight dump cars each pulled by gasoline-powered engines, made a perpetual circuit over the tracks. While 32 men -- four per car loaded the train up at one end, 32 others unloaded the other one at the far end, being careful to spread the rock level. When the empty train arrived, the other had to leave filled; this was supposed to happen every twenty minutes. Generally, the first train left in the time prescribed. However, with the second, there were delays which provoked growls from the *Meister*, the *Kapo*, and the *Vorarbeiter*. On the third circuit, the empty train had already been waiting for five minutes and another five were needed before it was ready to leave. The *Meister* smiled ironically and shrugged his shoulders, the *Kapo* shouted, and the *Vorarbeiter* lashed at us; no one escaped being hit. The delay was increased by the amount of time that it took three men to beat thirty-two, and from then on the time lost was never made up, and the work was off schedule for the rest of the day. On the fourth trip, there was a further delay; more blows rained down. On the fifth the *Kapo* -- and *Vorarbeiter* -- grasped the fact that nothing could be done, and they gave up beating us. In the evening, instead of the thirty-six trips planned at the rate of three per hour, only fifteen or twenty had with difficulty been achieved.

Noon: a pint of hot coffee was distributed right where we worked. We drank it standing up while eating the remains of the bread, margarine and sausage given out in the morning.

Twelve thirty: we began work again. During the afternoon the work dragged. The men, hungry and frozen, had just enough strength to keep standing. The *Kapo* disappeared, the *Vorarbeiter* calmed down, the *Meister* himself seemed to recognize that there was nothing more to be got from such rags as we were, and he gave up. We kept up an appearance of working, but that was hard, too. We had to rub our hands and stamp our feet for the cold. From time to time, an S.S. guard went by. The *Vorarbeiter*, on the lookout, saw him coming from way off and gave the signal. When he reached the *Kommando*, everybody was busy at his job. He tossed out a word to the *Meister*, "*Wie geht's?*" (How's it going?) A discouraged shrug of the shoulders answered, "*Langsam, langsam, Sehr langsam! Schauen Sie mal diese lumpen: Was machen mit?*" (Slow, slow, very slow. Just look at these no-goods. What can you do with them?) The S.S. guard shrugged his shoulders, too, grunted and went on, or else, depending on his humor, gave vent to insults, handed out a few blows of his fist,

threatened with his revolver, and left the area. Once he was outside of earshot the *Kommando* relaxed again. "*Aufpassen! Aufpassen!*" said the *Meister* almost paternally.

Six o'clock came, and everybody slackened off. "*Feierabend,*" (Knock off) said the *Meister*. The *Kapo* who had returned a few minutes before, had his men stack the tools, shouted a few insults which stimulated the *Vorarbeiter*, and distributed a few cuffs; a return to discipline through the use of terror.

Six forty: the *Kommando* started the march back to the camp in fives. At seven o'clock, organized by Block, and not by *Kommando*, we once again waited shivering, feet in the mud, for these gentlemen to finish counting us; that job took two or three hours.

Between eight and nine o'clock we got to the Block. A *Stubendienst*, rubber truncheon in hand, was stationed at the entrance. We had to take our shoes off, wash the wooden soles and enter with them in our hands; and then only if they passed as really cleaned were we allowed to go in. On the way to the *Esszimmer* we put them down in rows; then we held out tin bowls into which theoretically a quart of soup was poured, which we ate standing up in an indescribable jostling. When these various formalities were over, a third *Stubendienst* gave us permission to make for the *Schlafsaal*, where we simply fell in a heap on a little straw that had been brought in during the day. Half past ten. We were dead tired, hungry, and cold. We felt that the work forced on us counted for very little in contributing to our fatigue.

The next morning, it all began again at four-thirty. During the night the Russians stole the *Holzschuhe* which we had so carefully lined up in the *Esszimmer* at the command of the *Stubendienst*. Thus, in addition to the washing and the distribution of food, we had to locate another pair before running outside, while still dressing and swallowing the last mouthful of the meager breakfast, into the cold night to reach the mustering grounds where the *Kapos* were waiting. By the end of the week we had become shadows of our former selves.

* * * * *

There were worse *Kommandos* than ours: the Ellrich *Kommando*, the Transport Eins and all the transport *Kommandos*, *Steinbruch*, *Gartnerei* ..., etc.

At the other end of the Tunnel, camp Ellrich was being built. A very important *Kommando* of about a thousand men went there every morning on a ballast train which left the station at Dora at half past four. There were three miles to go. On foot it would only have been necessary to leave at half past five to get there by seven o'clock, but that would have been too simple. The S.S. authorities decided to show that they had some human feelings and, to spare the *Kommando* the fatigue of the march, they ordered the prisoners to be transported to work by the train. As a consequence, the Ellrich *Kommando* was awakened at three; the men washed, got rations and were at the mustering grounds at four. Then came the departure from the station. The train which was due at four-thirty was never less than an hour late, and

the *Kommando* had to wait. At six at the earliest, half past six at the latest, it arrived at Ellrich. The work consisted of digging all day. The work stopped at six. Theoretically, the prisoners should have gotten on the train at half past six, but like the morning train, it was never less than an hour late. They had to wait again. At about half past eight, at the best, but often nine or even ten, they returned to Dora where they had to observe all of the formalities of going into the Block, the shoe washing, and the distribution of soup. At about eleven they could lie down and sleep; five hours of sleep and up again, assembly, departure, waiting. The grind of the days was merciless; the steps that the S.S. took, or pretended to take, to improve things turned into an additional torment. The very travel back and forth was more killing than the work itself. Added to that fact was the fact that the *Kapos* of the Ellrich *Kommando* were the worst of brutes, whose blows rained down upon the prisoners without pity. Then, too, the work was rigorously supervised; in short, it was the *Kommando* of death, and every night corpses were brought back.

In the camp itself there was *Transport Eins*. The men of *Transport Eins* began their day in the same way and at the same time as all the others: they unloaded cars and carried on their backs heavy loads from the station to the tunnel, or from the station to the camp. We saw them from morning to evening working like circus horses in fours with large boards, by twos with railroad ties, by lines of eight or ten with rails, and singly with bags of cement. They moved slowly under the weight of their burden. Their *Kapo* was a Pole with the red triangle who went from one group to the next swearing, menacing, striking.

The *Gartnerei*, or garden *Kommando* also worked in teams like *Transport Eins*, but they carried human excrement instead of building material. The *Kapo* was a "green" who used the same methods as the Pole of *Transport Eins* with the same results.

The *Steinbruch*, the famous quarry for all of the camps, supplied rock building material. Stone was excavated and loaded on wagons which were pulled or pushed to the places where the stone was broken up to be used as surfacing for the camp roads. The people at the *Steinbruch* had the additional bad luck of having to work on the slope of the hill at the opening of the quarry where the beatings by the *Kapos* often caused them to lose their footings and to fall to the bottom of the quarry where they were killed. Every day the dead were brought back to the mustering grounds. Four men carried each body by the arms and legs. "*Ein, zwei, drei, vier*," the *Kapo* at the head of the column called out to set the pace; ploc, ploc, ploc, the heads of the dead men knocked against the ground. From time to time we heard that some poor devil at the *Steinbruch*, having been hit with a truncheon tottered and fell into the stone-crusher, or the concrete-mixer, without anyone trying to stop him.

There were also *Kommandos* that were better. Among them were all those that made up the camp administration: the *Lager Kommando*, the *Holzhof*, the *Bauleitung*, the *Schwung*.

At the *Effektenkammer*, an account was kept of the clothing that had been taken away from the prisoners when they came into the camp; that was an easy job. It was lucrative, too. From time to time a pair of pants could be stolen, or a watch, or a fountain pen, all of which were valuable exchange goods for food. At the *Wascherei*, the underwear which the prisoners were supposed to change every two weeks was

washed. There it was sheltered and warm. Also quite a few opportunities presented themselves to obtain food. At the *Schusterei*, the shoes were repaired, at the *Schneiderei*, clothing was repaired and underclothing mended, and at the *Küche*...

The best *Kommando* was without question the kitchen or *Küche Kommando*. The food was not rationed to those who prepared it, and the work was not difficult. First they got the ration that was given to everyone at the Block before starting for work. When they got to the kitchen or place where they worked, they received a supplementary ration officially. Then, whenever they were hungry they could help themselves from the provisions that they were preparing. In addition, they stole food in order to provide themselves with exchange for tobacco, socks, clothes, and favors. On top of that, they were exempt from the roll-call. They lived the life of regimental cooks. A certain amount of influence was necessary to get into the *Küche Kommando*; the French did not have it; and, as a result, the positions were reserved for Germans, Czechs and Poles.

On a par with the *Küche* were the *Arbeitsstatistik* and the *Revier*. There was no roll-call either. Blows were not the usual practice. At the *Arbeitsstatistik*, the work was office work, and one could obtain as much food as one wanted because those who were assigned to the better *Kommandos* by the personnel there paid in kind: clothing, food, tobacco, etc. I know two Frenchmen who had managed to get themselves into the *Arbeitsstatistik*; all the rest were Germans, Czechs, and Poles, as in the kitchen service.

In the *Revier*, there were doctors, *Pflegers*, and *Kalifaktors*. The *Pflegers*, or nurses of sorts, took care of the patients, and the *Kalifaktors* were responsible for the cleanliness of the hospital. In addition, there were a lot of clerks, who ate their fill; you could hardly say that they worked, and they were not beaten.

Then came the *Lagerkommando*, or the *Kommando* responsible for the maintenance of the camp. All those prisoners in delicate health were assigned there, in principle. Actually only those prisoners with pull, with friends among the *Kapos* and *Lagerschutz*, with influential friends in the *Revier* or the *Küche*, or with relatives who sent good parcels were assigned to the *Lagerkommando*. The *Lagerkommando* supplied crews for light janitorial work, cook-house work for the S.S., the *Häftling*, -- and the volunteer foreign workers who worked in the factories at the camp, and for the care of the *Altverwertung*, the place where things were repaired. At the beginning, when the camp was still small, it was a very much sought after spot. Later on, when the *Kommando* had grown to include hundreds and hundreds of individuals, the personnel were periodically screened for manpower to fill out other *Kommandos* without enough men, a fate which was escaped only by those with pull.

Two other *Kommandos* were also sought after: the *Tabakfabrik* and the *Zuckerfabrik*. They both went to Nordhausen to work, and they were transported in trucks. Each evening, the first group came back with pockets full of tobacco which they exchanged for bread and soup, and the others did the same with sugar. Afterwards, a third *Kommando* was assigned to the slaughter houses at Nordhausen, and they introduced meat barter into the camp.

To get a good or a bad *Kommando* was a matter of chance, which connections with someone in the *Arbeitsstatistik* could decisively influence. The constant preoccupation of all the prisoners was to get into a good *Kommando*, and this overriding objective was pursued by any means regardless of how incompatible it might be with human dignity.

* * * * *

The Tunnel *Kommandos* were considered both the best and the worst. They were formed into a single *Kommando*, called *Zavatsky*, after the name of the supervisor who ran the Tunnel operations.

They had at their head a *Kapo* general -- the great Georges -- who had under his orders a whole team of *Kapos* in charge of prisoners according to their specialties. To be assigned to a *Kommando* working in one of the ten or twelve factories sheltered in the Tunnel was to be guaranteed light labor and to be protected from the wind, the rain, and the cold. All this was a very great advantage. Such an assignment also guaranteed being free of the roll-calls, since there were no roll-calls for the Tunnel people. But, it was also a certainty that the tunnel workers never came up into the daylight, and had to breathe in galleries that were badly ventilated. Consequently, they were afflicted with miasmas of all sorts and dust for months on end, and they risked dying before they were liberated. But on the road building, for example, one worked in all kinds of weather: rain, snow, wind, or hot sunshine. In other words, the work never stopped. Nor were the roll-calls cancelled or shortened. During the rainy season it happened that for weeks on end we could never get the rags that served us for clothing dry. In the evening, coming back to the Block, we put our clothes under the straw mattresses in the hope that the heat of our bodies would evaporate the dampness. The next morning we put them on warmed, but wet, and we went out once again into the rain. Simple or double pneumonia was endemic among the road workers, and many ended up in the crematorium, but at least we were living out in the open. And, during the good weather... Opinion was divided between wanting to work in the Tunnel or on the roads. "One should be able to get in the Tunnel during the winter, and come out during the summer," Fernand said to me. That solution was obviously impossible, and I was not sure that in the end that it would be a good solution.

What was called the Tunnel was a system of two parallel galleries going through a mountain from one side to the other. At one end was Dora, and at the other was the hell of Ellrich. These two main galleries, each about three miles long, were connected by about 50 transverse galleries or halls each about 200 yards long, 8 yards wide, and 8 yards high. Each one of these halls contained a work shop. In April 1945 the Tunnel was all finished and if it had not been for the sabotage would have produced at maximum capacity. It was estimated that at that time there was a total of eight to ten miles of galleries, excavated and fitted out, as against the five to six in existence in August 1943, when Dora was just started. These figures give an idea of how hard the prisoners were made to work. It should also be noted that the two camps, Dora and Ellrich, together, could never handle more than 15,000 men, who had, in addition, to build barracks, as well as to produce a certain number of V1 and V2 rockets, or

airframes and secondary weapons. And, that if one wants to calculate the cost of this work, one must add to the francs or marks, the 20,000 to 25,000 human lives it cost in less than two years.

Twice every day, at seven in the morning and at seven in the evening, the *Kommandos* of the Tunnel who slept in the galleries, or in those parts of the galleries fixed up as Blocks, were awakened by shifts. They had less water; consequently the hygiene was deficient, and fleas and lice abounded. At nine in the morning and at nine in the evening depending on the *Schicht* to which they belonged, they were at work.

There were also bad *Kommandos* in the Tunnel. Those digging the galleries, and those who were assigned to the transportation of drilling tools and the excavated material had a bad time. Those *Kommandos* were veritable chain gangs whose members died like flies, their lungs poisoned by the ammonia laden dust. But, most of the Tunnel *Kommandos* were good.

In the factories, scientific management was carried to an extreme: one *Kommando* spent its time sitting in front of drills punching out holes one after the other; another inspected gyroscopes; a third assembled electrical switches; a fourth polished sheet metal; a fifth was made of turners or fitters. And, there were some jobs that were neither good nor bad like those involved in the assembly of the V1 and V2 rockets. Generally speaking, the productivity was not very good: ten men were employed at a job, against their will, which one or two could have done if they had had the incentive. The most difficult things were always to pretend to be working, to be standing up all the time, to seem to be very busy, and, above all, to live in that noise and miasma, getting hardly any air from the outside through the few and inefficient air ducts

Toward the middle of March, at the request of Zavatzky, who wanted to eliminate one of the main causes which he thought was responsible for the poor output, they began to take the Tunnel *Kommandos* up into the open air to have their camp soup, instead of taking the soup down to them. By the end of April, the construction gangs had finished just about all of the Blocks that had been planned: 132 of them. It was decided that no one would sleep in the Tunnel any more. So, all the *Kommandos* after that date only went underground to work, that is, for twelve hours a day.

To give the whole picture, it must be said that civilians, too were used in the various factories in the Tunnel. In April 1945, there were six to seven thousand of them. They included the Germans who were *Meister*, and the S.T.O. or volunteers from all over Europe. They too were grouped in *Commando*, but they lived in a camp about a mile from Dora, worked ten hours a day, got good wages and ate fairly monotonous food, but which was healthful and plentiful. Besides they were free to move about within an 18 mile radius; in order to go beyond that, they needed special papers. Among them were many Frenchmen who kept themselves at a distance from us and in whose eyes one always saw the fear that they had that they might some day have to share our lot.

The date was March 31, 1944. For the past week the *Kapos*, the *Lagerschutz*, and the Block Chiefs had been particularly on edge. Quite a number of prisoners had died from blows; lice were found not only in the Tunnel, but even among the *Kommandos* outside; and the *S. S.-Führung* laid the responsibility for this state of affairs on the *H-*

Führung. On top of that, the weather the whole day long was terrible: it was colder than usual, and an icy rain mixed with hail came down without any let-up. In the evening, we got to the muster grounds, frozen, soaked, and hungry beyond belief. How we hoped the roll would not last too long! But, there was no such luck. At ten o'clock we were still standing at attention under the rain of hail, waiting for the order *Abtreten* (break ranks!) which would liberate us. Finally it came, and we could go and eat the hot soup in a hurry and fall onto the straw. We got to the Block and began the shoe cleaning. But, then, gesturing that we should stay outside, the Block Chief, standing framed in the entrance, announced that since lice had been found, the whole camp was going to be disinfected. It was to begin that night. Five of the 35 Blocks were picked for *Entläusung* -- (delousing) that night. Consequently, that night there was no soup until that was over. The delousing process then began: "*Alles da drin!*" (Everybody in there!) We went into the *Esszimmer* with our shoes in our hands. "*Ausziehen!*" (Undress!) We took our clothes off, wrapped them in a bundle with the number on top. "*Zu fünf!*" (By fives!) That frightened us. "*Zu fünf!*" We form into lines. With the *Stubendienst* carrying our clothes on blankets, surrounding us, all naked, in the cold, in the rain and the snow, we went in the direction of the building where we were to be deloused. There were about 800 yards to cross.

When we got there, the four other Blocks, naked like us, were already pushing against the entrance. We felt Death in our presence. How long would it last? There were about a thousand of us, all naked and shaking in the wet and the cold which penetrated to our very bones, pushing at the doors. There was no way to get in. Only forty at a time could go in. The scene was hideous. At first we tried to force our way in, but the delousing men kept us back with water hoses. Then we wanted to go back to the Block to wait our turns; but that was impossible since the *Lagerschutz*, truncheons in hand, surrounded us. So we had to stay there, crowded together, between the water and the truncheons, soaked and beaten. We pressed together. Every ten minutes, forty of us were allowed to enter the delousing chamber in a crush that was a life and death struggle. Elbows went into play; there were fights, and the weaker were mercilessly trampled underfoot, and their bodies were found at dawn. At about two in the morning, I succeeded in getting inside, Fernand behind me, where we received a haircut, cressyl, and shower. At the exit we were given a shirt and a pair of shorts which we wore when we went out into the night to return to the Block. I felt as though I had accomplished some act of heroism. When we came to the Block, we went into the *Esszimmer* where a *Stubendienst* handed us our clothes which had been disinfected. Next came soup and bed.

At reveille, the sinister comedy was just barely finishing. At least half of the Block got back only just in time to get dressed, get soup, get the daily ration, and hurry to the grounds to go to work. And, there were a number missing: those who had died during the execution of this sorry business. Others survived it only for a few hours or for two or three days and were carried away with the inevitable double pneumonia. The job itself probably killed as many men as it did lice.

How did it happen? The *S.S.-Führung* -- was responsible only for the decision to disinfect five Blocks per day, and the *H-Führung* was left in complete control of how it was to be carried out. A schedule could have been set up: at eleven, Block 35, at midnight, 24, at one, number 32, etc... The Block Chiefs could have, within this

frame-work, sent us in groups of one hundred at twenty minute intervals, for example, and in our clothes. But no, that would have been too simple.

When what took place on the night of March 31st reached the ears of the S.S.-*Führung*, the latter itself set up an exact schedule the next morning for the Blocks that remained to be disinfected.

* * * * *

April 2. 1944: Easter. The S.S.-*Führung* decided on a twenty-four hour rest period which was not to be disturbed except by a general roll-call, that is, the Tunnel people as well as the quarry workers would be present. The weather was magnificent, a radiant sun in a pure calm sky. Joy; the Gods were with us! We got up at six instead of four-thirty: washing and food distribution was done at a slower pace.

Nine o'clock. All the *Kommandos* were on the grounds at attention. The *Lagerschutz* went in and out among the groups: Block Chiefs were at their stations. The *Lagerältester* -- chatted familiarly with the *Rapportführer*. He had a paper in his hand: a detailed list of the camp personnel drawn up by the *Arbeitsstatistik*. About thirty S.S. in helmets, their pistols in holsters, were assembled at the entrance to the camp: the *Blockführer*. It looked as though all were going to go well.

A whistle blew, and the *Blockführer* spread out fan-wise, each toward the Block which it was his responsibility to oversee. Each one made his count and compared his figure with that which the Block Chief handed him. "*Richtig*" (Correct.) One by one the *Blockführer* came to report to the *Rapportführer* who waited, pencil in hand, and who wrote down the figures as they were given him.

There was not one discordant note: the roll-call would not last long. The S.S. wanted to take advantage of this Sunday and were moving fast. We were exultant: one day to rest with nothing to do but to eat our soup and to stretch out in the sun.

Just a minute! The total number of prisoners which the *Rapportführer* had, did not tally with the figure given to him by the *Arbeitsstatistik*: there were twenty-seven fewer men on the grounds than on the paper. Question: what had become of them? The *Kapo* of the *Arbeitsstatistik* was sent for in a hurry. He was asked to go over his figures right away. One hour later he came back with the same figure. Perhaps, then, the S.S. had made a mistake. The count was made again, and the *Rapportführer* came up with the same figure. They searched through the Blocks, they searched through the Tunnel: they found none of the missing prisoners.

It was noon. The ten thousand or so prisoners were still on the grounds waiting for the figures of the *Arbeitsstatistik* and of the S.S.-*Führung* to agree. Time dragged: some men fainted: those whose turn it was to die fell down never to get up again: those with dysentery relieved themselves as they stood: the *Lagerschutz* felt that things were getting slack and began to lay about. The S.S. guards whose Sunday was threatened were furious. They went off to eat, but we stayed there. At two o'clock they came back.

Suddenly the *Kapo* of the *Arbeitsstatistik* came running: he had come up with another figure. A murmur of hope rose from the crowd. The *Rapportführer* looked over the new figure and became violently angry: there were still eight men missing. The *Kapo* of the *Arbeitsstatistik* went away again. He came back at four. Now no more than five men were missing. At eight only one was still missing, and we were still there, pale, drawn, and exhausted, after having stood for eleven hours, with empty stomachs. The S.S. decided to send us to eat. We left. Behind us the *Totenkommando* picked up some thirty dead.

At nine, it all began again, in an attempt to find the missing man. At eleven forty-five, after various comings and goings, this missing man was found, too: the *S.S.-Führung* and the *Arbeitsstatistik* were in agreement. We went back to our Blocks and were able to go to bed, again leaving behind us ten or more dead.

There you have the explanation of why the roll-calls took so long. Those employed in the *Arbeitsstatistik*, illiterate or nearly so, had been made bookkeepers only as a favor, and they were incapable of adding up at the first count the number of men present. The concentration camp was a world where every man's place was determined by his connections and his cunning and not by his abilities. Accountants were made masons, carpenters became accountants, wheelwrights became doctors and doctors became fitters, electricians or road graders

* * * * *

Every day a railway car, full of packages from every western European country, except Spain and Portugal arrived at the Dora station. With a few exceptions, these packages were intact. However, by the time that a package was given to the one to whom it was addressed, it had been three quarters pilfered. In many cases, one got nothing but the sticker listing the contents: shaving soap, or shaving brush, or a comb, etc...

A *Kommando* of Czechs and Russians were detailed to unload this car. From there, the package was taken to the *Poststelle* where the *Schreiber* and *Stubendienst* -- of each Block went to take delivery. Then the Block Chief himself gave it to the addressee. It was during this chain of distribution that the packages were plundered.

The way the pillage was worked was simple. First, it was the French parcels, known for the wealth of their contents, which got all the attention. Right where the parcels were unloaded, under the eyes of an S.S. guard in charge of the operation, they were passed through three hands: at the car a Czech passed it to a Russian standing outside, who had to catch it in air and toss it to another Russian or Czech, whose job it was to stack it onto a wagon. From time to time, the Czech at the car said "Franzous," and the Russian spread wide his hands; the parcel fell to the ground where it broke open, the contents spilling all over. The Russians and Czechs filled their pockets or musette bags. If something from the parcel pleased the S.S. guard, he held out his hand and thus was his complicity bought. When the wagon was full, pulled by six men it rumbled off toward the *Poststelle*; during this brief trip, a number of parcels disappeared or also broke open.

Regulations required that at the *Poststelle* the parcels were to be carefully examined, and that medicines, wine, any alcohol and weapons or various things that could be used as weapons, be removed. This official search was made by a team of prisoners (Germans or Slavs, under the surveillance of two or three S.S. and provided another opportunity for more filching. The S.S. guards themselves were tempted occasionally by a piece of bacon, a bar of chocolate which a girlfriend liked, a package of cigarettes, or a lighter. They made sure that the prisoners would not talk by closing their eyes to the thievery that was committed by the latter. From the *Poststelle* to the Block, the *Schreiber* and *Stubendienst* arranged things between them so that a third pilfering took place, and at the end of the distribution chain, there was the Block Chief who did the fourth and last and who gave what was left to the addressee.

There was something grotesque about the ceremony of handing over the remains to the party concerned. The prisoner was summoned by his number and invited to present himself to the Block Chief. On the latter's desk lay his parcel, open and contents listed. By the desk was a large basket surmounted by a placard labeled "*Solidaritat*." Each prisoner was morally obliged to drop in a little something of what he had received for those who never received anything in particular the Russians, the Spaniards, the young and the disinherited of all nationalities who had no relatives or whose relatives did not know where they were.

This is what was supposed to happen in theory; in practice, the Block Chief, after each distribution, simply appropriated what was in the basket and divided it with his *Schreiber* and the *Stubendienst*. After every load was received, the *Kapos*, the *Lagerschutz*, the *Blockältester*, and all those with any rank at all in the *S.S.-Führung* were amply supplied with French provisions, a fact which convinced me that the pillaging was done by an organized gang.

I received my first parcel on April 5, 1944: all the underclothing, a bar of chocolate, I think, and a tin of jam were missing, but there were still three packs of cigarettes, a good two pounds of bacon, a tin of butter and various other eatables. We had changed Blocks two days before, and we were now in 11. Our Block Chief was a German with a black patch. I asked him what he would like. "*Nichts, geh mal*." (Nothing, get going.) Resolutely I held out a package of cigarettes to him, then pointing to the "*Solidaritat*" basket, I questioned with my eyes. "*Brauchst nicht! Geh mal, Blöde Kerl!*" -- (Don't bother, get going, you dumb ass!).

I had guessed correctly. The day after the next, I was called up again. I had three parcels this time. Of one nothing was left but the label; but the two others were more or less intact and in one there was a huge hunk of bacon. "*Dein Messer*," (Your knife) I said to the Block Chief. I cut off a good half which I handed him and then I went off without asking whether I should leave something in the "*Solidaritat*" basket. He watched me go with gaping eyes. The French had a reputation, which was deserved, of being very tight with their parcels and not very generous. Suddenly he called me back. "*Dein Nummer?*" (Your number?)

He wrote it down, and then, said to me, "*Höre, mal, Kamerad, deine Paketten werden nie mehr gestollen werden. Das sage ich. Geh mal jetzt!*" (Listen, your parcels won't be pilfered any more. That I can tell you. Now get going!")

Indeed, from that day on my parcels were given to me just about intact. The Block Chief had passed my number on to the various stations in the chain of distribution, implying an order "do not touch". And, it was to that fact that I owe my life since the parcels which came from France, aside from the fact that they contained food supplements to the camp diet, were a precious exchange currency with which exemptions from work, extra clothing, and light jobs could be bought. They made it possible for me to spend eight months in the infirmary, when others, just as sick, spent the same time working until they died.

Concerning the parcels, another tragic phenomenon took place. Most of the French, even those from very comfortable families, received one parcel three quarters plundered; then they received nothing more. It was only after the liberation that I got an explanation. On arrival at the camp the prisoners wrote to their families, saying that they had the right to write twice a month. The family sent a parcel, and, since it was the first, before sending another they waited for an acknowledgment of receipt which never came, because except for the first, only one out of ten letters that we wrote arrived at its destination. In the camp, the prisoner who wrote regularly wondered what was the matter. And, while he was dying of starvation, his family in France was convinced that it was not worth while to send a second package because, since he had not acknowledged reception of the first, he must surely be dead. My wife, who regularly sent me a parcel every day, told me that she did it for her conscience's sake and against all hope; my mother herself was of the opinion that she was sending them to a dead man and that, in addition to the mourning, she was throwing her money away.

* * * * *

On June 1, 1944, the camp was unrecognizable. Since March 15, convoys of 800, of 1,000, of 1,500 prisoners kept coming and coming once or twice a week. And, the population grew to about 15.000 individuals. If the population did not climb beyond this figure, it was because the death rate came very close to the arrival rate. Every day fifty to eighty bodies were carried out in the direction of the crematorium. The *H-Führung* itself made up one tenth of the total number in the camp. Fourteen to eighteen hundred men with soft jobs, all powerful and full of their importance, ruled over the *vulgum pecus*. With cigarettes in their mouths, plenty of soup in their stomachs, and with beer to quench their thirsts, they almost lived in another world.

Block 141, destined to be the movie theater, was under construction and the brothel was ready to receive the women. All of the Blocks, geometrically and agreeably set out on the hill were connected with concrete streets. Cement staircases with railings, led up to the higher Blocks. In front of each of them were pergolas with climbing plants and little gardens with carpets of flowers; here and there were cross roads with a fountain or statue. The mustering yard, which covered about half a square mile, was entirely paved, and was so clean you could not lose a pin on it. With a swimming pool that was fitted with a diving board in the center, a sports field, and shaded areas nearby, Dora was a regular resort camp for anyone who might happen in, when the prisoners were not there. In fact, such visitors would go away under the impression that a pleasant life was led there, not to be compared to the war risks which free men were running. The S.S. authorized the establishment of a music *Kommando*. After that, every morning and evening, a band of wind instruments, supported by a bass

drum and cymbals, gave rhythm to the march of the *Kommandos* going to and from work. During the day they practiced and deafened the immediate area with the most extraordinary sounds. On Sunday afternoon they gave concerts in the midst of general apathy while members of the prisoner elite played football or did acrobatics on the diving board.

Although the appearances had changed, the realities were the same. The *H-Führung* was still what it had always been, except that the politicals had worked their way in appreciable numbers and the prisoners, instead of being brutally treated by the "greens" got the same from the Communists or so-called Communists. Every person regularly received a wage, of two to five Marks per week. These wages were collected by the *H-Führung* who distributed them usually on Saturday evening in *Arbeitsstatistik* square. But, the distribution was done in such a way that chaotic mobs were created which made any attempt to get them tantamount to offering yourself for the crematorium. Very few prisoners were bold enough to claim their share. The *Kapos*, the Block Chiefs, and the *Lagerschutz*, divided up among themselves what they were relieved of having to pay out. Cigarettes too, were distributed -- twelve cigarettes every ten days -- for about 80 Pfennig on the average. We had no money to pay for them, and the Block Chiefs in charge of dividing them up exacted from those who did have some money such standards of cleanliness and order that it was just about impossible to get possession of one's ration. Finally, beer was distributed, in principle, to everyone. But, there again one had to be able to pay. The families of the prisoners were allowed to send them 30 Marks a month, which they no more received than their weekly wage or their cigarettes, and for the same reason. And, all in keeping with this, one day the *H-Führung* people decided to divide up the clothing and the various other things that had been taken away from us when we arrived at Buchenwald.

It can be added that for things to have reached that stage, thousands and thousands of prisoners had died as a result of natural causes, as a result of the life they were forced to lead, or as a result of their summary execution for various other reasons, especially for sabotage and were no longer around to claim their property that was stored in the *Effektenkammer*. From March 1944 to April 1945, not a week passed when I did not see three or four men hanged for sabotage. Toward the end, they were being hanged by tens and twenties, right in front of each others eyes. These executions took place on the muster grounds in front of everyone. A gallows was set up, the condemned men arrived, a gag in the shape of a bridle-bit was placed in their mouths, and their hands were tied behind their backs. They climbed onto a stool, and their heads were put into the hanging noose. With a kick, the *Lagerschutz* knocked the stool over. No sudden jerk; it took the poor people four, five or six minutes to die. One or two S.S. guards supervised. When the job was done, the whole camp filed past the bodies strung up on their ropes.

On February 28, 1945, thirty men were hanged in groups of ten. The heads of the first ten were placed into the nooses. The next ten were waiting their turn, at attention, near the stools: the following ten were standing five steps away, waiting for their turn. The following March 8th, nineteen men were hanged. This time the job took place in the Tunnel, and only the *Kommandos* of the Tunnel were witnesses. The nineteen condemned men were lined up in front of Hall 32. A huge pulley, to which nineteen ropes were attached, was slowly lowered above their heads. The *Lagerschutz* handed

out the nineteen nooses: then the pulley raised up slowly, slowly. Oh! How the eyes of the poor fellows grew large, and how their poor feet searched to keep some contact with the ground! On Palm Sunday, fifty-seven were hanged, just eight days before the liberation, when we had already heard Allied cannon fire very close and when the issue of the war could no longer be in any doubt for the S.S. But this was the way it was: the S.S. themselves discovered a certain number of cases of sabotage (in 1945, and since the middle of 1944, it had become impossible for anyone in the camp, or even on the outside to live without sabotaging); however, the *H-Führung*, without any mercy, pointed out to them an even greater number.

It is almost impossible to grasp the cost of this undertaking in human lives. On June 1, 1944, the population of the camp was almost exclusively made up of people who had arrived in March of that year or later. There were still seven prisoners whose numbers ranged between 13,500 and 15,000; at least 800 of them had arrived on July 18, 1943. There were about a dozen left in the 20,000 to 22,000 range, they had arrived in a group of about 1,500 in October, 1943. Of the 800 included in the 30,000 to 31,000 group, who arrived in December-January, there remained about fifty; of the 1,200 taken from the 38,000 to 44,000 group, who came in February-March, three or four hundred survived. Those prisoners who wore numbers 45,000 to 50,000 and who arrived during May 1944, were still more or less all there; but not for long.

Chapter Five

Port of Grace; Anteroom of Death

On July 28, 1943, when the first convoy arrived in the beet fields in front of the Tunnel, there was no question of any *Revier*. They had sent only those prisoners from Buchenwald who were supposed to be in good health, and it was not anticipated that they might fall sick right away: but, should this happen, the S.S. had orders to pay attention only to serious cases, to report them by mail, and to wait for instructions. Naturally, the S.S. never discovered anyone seriously sick; anyone who has been a soldier will easily understand that.

The weather was beastly that year. It rained and rained. Pneumonia and pleurisy ran rampant, and made great inroads among those who were weak and badly treated, who were wet all day long, and who had to sleep at night in damp caves in the rock. In eight days, those unfortunates were doubled up with what the S.S. called a little fever, which seemed to worsen, but they didn't know why. The regulations were that one was not sick unless one had a temperature of more than 39.5°C. (103°F.), in which case one could get a *Schonung*, or work exemption. Until you had such a fever you had to keep on working, and when you did have such a temperature it meant death.

Then there was what we called dysentery, but which was in reality uncontrollable diarrhea. One fine day, for no clear reason, one was overcome with digestive troubles which rapidly developed into an inability to tolerate anything. There was no remedy: one had simply to wait for it to stop, without eating anything. It lasted eight, ten, fifteen days, depending on the resistance of the sick man, who got weaker, who finally began to fall down, without any strength left to move, even to take care of his needs, and who then succumbed to the fever that accompanied it. This sickness, fortunately easier to detect than pneumonia or pleurisy, led the S.S. to take steps, with what means they had available, to check it. They ordered the construction of a *Bud*, where, without regard for their temperatures, those with diarrhea were admitted on showing the proper paper and so long as there was space available.

The *Bud* could hold thirty people. Very soon there were fifty, a hundred, and more, their number ever growing as new convoys arrived from Buchenwald and as the camp grew larger. Generally, the diarrhetics were sent there only in the last stages of the illness, and then only to die there. They were piled together right on the ground, packed like sardines, unmindful of what was under them; it was an epidemic. It got to such a point that for health reasons the S.S. had the first *H-Führung* pick out a *Pfleger*, or nurse, to keep order among the sick and help them to keep themselves clean. The job was given to a "green" (naturally!), a carpenter by trade, who had been sentenced for murder. A fine job was done...!

All the day long people were lined up at the entrance to the *Bud*. The *Pfleger*, truncheon in hand, calmed down the impatient ones. From time to time a corpse was

brought out of the stench, and a space was made which was jumped at. The number of diarrhetics only increased. When the S.S. saw that the *Pfleger* was not up to the task, the latter pointed out that he had a lot of work to do all alone, and he was given an assistant of whom the S. S. required that he know his business. The job fell to a Dutch doctor who had been employed, until then, in the work of transporting goods from the station to the Tunnel. From that moment on the *Bud* became humanized, the *Pfleger* became *Kapo*, and the Dutchman worked under his orders, exercising prodigious diplomacy. He managed to save one diarrhetic, whose cure he was careful to conceal in order to keep him by his side as a nurse. With the help of a big supply of charcoal, the diarrhea was checked, the S.S. declared themselves satisfied, and the *Bud* could be used for something else. The first *Revier* was born.

In fact, the Dutchman was able to fix it so that as places were left available by the diarrhetics, those with pneumonia and pleurisy with temperatures of 38°C (109°F) and up could be admitted. But, this practice aroused the resentment of his *Kapo*! He even began to claim that with a little charcoal it would be possible to care effectively for the diarrhetics without hospitalizing them, if they were caught soon enough, and that, therefore, there would be more room for those with pneumonia and pleurisy. The duel was Homeric. An S.S. doctor, who had been assigned to the camp and who had arrived in November along with the officers of a convoy, after having remained indifferent to this conflict for a long time, ended by backing up the Dutchman. And, the building of a Block was begun, the *Bud* having rapidly become too small.

Then it was the turn of those with nephritis. Nephritis was inherent in the life of the camp: under-nourishment, too many hours standing up, the effects of bad weather, pneumonia, pleurisy, the rock salt -- the only kind there was in Germany -- which the cooks used immoderately, and which, it seems, was harmful because it contained no iodine. Cases of edema were legion; everybody had legs more or less swollen.

It goes away, they said, it's the salt that does it. And no more attention than that was paid to it. When it was an innocuous edema, it did sometimes disappear! When the edema was the outcome of nephritis, one was carried away, one fine day, with an attack of uremia. The Dutchman succeeded in getting those with nephritis hospitalized, too. Another Block had to be built. Then it was the turn of those with tuberculosis, and so on. The expansion continued to such an extent that on June 1, 1944, the *Revier* was composed of Blocks 16, 17, 38, 39, 126, 127, and 128, grouped around the top of the hill. Fifteen hundred patients could be put there, at one person per bed, or a tenth of the camp's population. Each Block was divided into wards, where related sicknesses were assigned.

Block 16 was the administrative center of the whole structure. The Dutchman was promoted to the rank of Head Doctor. Meanwhile, the S.S. replaced the "green" *Lagerältester* with a "red" and there was a great commotion in the *H-Führung*. The *Kapo* of the *Revier* was the first victim of the new *Lagerältester*. A plan was set up to catch him in the act of stealing the food destined for the sick. He was sent to the Ellrich camp by way of punishment, and he was replaced by Proell.

* * * * *

Proell was a young German, about 27 or 28 years old. In 1934, he had intended to take up medicine. But as the son of a Communist and as a Communist himself, he was arrested when he was still only a child. He spent the next ten years in various camps.

First he was sent to Dachau where it was due only to his youth that he survived the rigors of that budding camp. Neither the S.S. nor the adult prisoners had their knives out for the youngsters: the first because of a kind of respect for real innocence; the second because of a special tenderness which nourished in them the hope of seeing the youngsters become affectionate later. Thanks to these two circumstances, Proell managed to get into the *Revier* as a *Pfleger* and to stay there for several years. Then, he was sent to Mauthausen in that capacity. The "green" *Häftlingsführung* of Mauthausen got rid of him by sending him to Auschwitz, where he was included in the first convoy that was sent to Natzweiler. It was at Natzweiler that he spent his longest time. There he was promoted to *Kapo* of the *Lagerkommando* and was attached to the *Lagerältester*. The few prisoners who knew him in that camp were unanimous in saying that they never had seen such a brute. A palace revolution in the *H-Führung* of Natzweiler caused his removal to Buchenwald from whence he was sent to Dora as a confidant of the Communists and *Kapo* of the *Revier*.

At Dora, Proell behaved like all the other *Kapos* -- neither better nor worse. He was intelligent and organized the *Revier* along the lines laid down by the Dutchman, whom he considered, in spite of everything a valuable assistant because he was competent. To be sure, he did not always follow the moral commandments of medicine. He was brutal, and in making up the army of *Pfleger* that he needed to carry out the job, he gave preference to the politicals before the professionals. That is how the blacksmith Heinz, who was a Communist and who had managed to get himself into the *Revier* under the regime of the "green" *Kapo* as *Oberpfleger* (head nurse), was completely trusted by him against the advice of all the other medical people. That is also why, to a medical student whose political opinions he knew did not agree with his, he always preferred any lout, German, Czech, Russian or Polish. He had a great admiration for the Russians, and a weakness for the Czechs, who in his eyes had been abandoned to Hitler by the English and the French of whom he was contemptuous. But, he was an organizer of the first order.

In less than a month, the *Revier* was organized on the lines of the big hospitals: in Block 16, the administration, admissions and emergencies; in 17 and 39, general treatment, the kidney cases and those with neuritis; in 38, surgery; in 126, pneumonia and pleurisy; in 127 and 198 the tubercular. In each Block there was a doctor in charge, assisted by an *Oberpfleger*; in each ward, a *Pfleger* for nursing and a *Kalifaktor* for other duties. For the sick two-bunk beds only, one above the other, with a mattress stuffed with wood shavings, sheets and blankets. There were three diets: the *Hauskost*, or food in every way like that given out in the camp, for those whose digestive tracts were not affected; the *Schleimkost*, or thin semolina soup (no bread, no margarine, no sausage), for those who required a low diet; the *Diatkost*, which every day consisted of two soups, one sweetened, and white bread, margarine and jam, for those who needed building up.

It cannot be said that one was very well taken care of in the *Revier*. The *S.S.-Führung* dispensed very little medicines and drugs, and Proell filched from the lot all that was necessary for the *H-Führung* letting only that which they didn't need filter through to

the sick themselves. But, the beds were clean; one rested; and the food ration, although not of better quality than for the rest of the camp, was still more abundant. Proell himself limited his activities as *Kapo* to one visit which each day was accompanied with shouts and some generously bestowed blows on the personnel and the sick who had been caught disobeying *Revier* regulations. Life there could have been a contrast to the prevailing conditions in the rest of the camp, if the *Pfleger* and *Kalifaktor*, as much out to zeal and loyalty to tradition as out of fear of the *Kapo*, had not been bent on trying to make it intolerable.

* * * * *

Every night after roll-call, a mob collected at the entrance to Block 16. Block 16 included, aside from the administration office for the *Revier*, an *Aussere-Ambulanz* and an *Innere-Ambulanz*. The first took care of the immediate needs of all those who, sick or having met with an accident, did not meet the requirements for being hospitalized; the second determined, after examination, those who should or should not be hospitalized.

Aside from the *H-Führung*, everyone in the camp was sick, and, under conditions which prevail in the normal world, everyone would have been hospitalized without exception and without delay, even if only on account of their extreme debility. In the camp, the situation was quite the opposite. There, general debility did not count; only those conditions which exceeded such debility were taken care of, and then only under certain extra-therapeutic circumstances or when nothing else could be done. Every prisoner was, therefore, more or less a candidate for the *Revier*. They had to make a rule that one could apply for admission every four days, on an average.

First of all there were the boils. The whole camp had suppurative furunculosis, the result of the lack of meat and roughage in the food. It was endemic just like the benign edema and the nephritis. There were the sores on the hands or feet or both. Finally there were cut fingers, arms or legs broken, and the like. They made up the patients of the *Aussere-Ambulanz* and from June 1, 1944, were in the hands of the Negro, Johnny, whose incompetence as a doctor had finally been recognized at the Buchenwald *Revier*. In spite of the political pledges that he had given, he was sent to us in a transport, as a doctor, naturally, but with a note stating that it would be more prudent to use him as a nurse. Proell thought that he was just right for the *Aussere-Ambulanz*, and put him in charge. I learned afterwards that he had been astute enough to get the protection of Katzenellenbogen, that prisoner who called himself an American by origin, who was the general physician of the Camp, and who committed so many extortions that he was considered a war criminal after liberation.

Johnny had under him a whole company of *Pfleger*, Germans, Poles, Czechs or Russians, who knew nothing whatever of the job they were charged with; they put on dressings, took them off and put them on again when it struck their fancy. For boils or wounds, there was only one remedy: ointment. Those gentlemen had before them pots of ointments of all colors. On the same sore, they one day put the black salve and another day put the red or the yellow, and there was no guessing what determined their choice. Luckily, all of the ointments were antiseptic!

To the *Innere-Ambulanz* went everybody who hoped to get hospitalized. Every night there were five or six hundred, each one just as sick as the other. Sometimes there were ten or fifteen beds available. Put yourself in the place of the doctor who had to choose which ten or fifteen... The others were sent back with or without *Schonung*. They appeared the next day and every day until they had the luck to be admitted. Uncounted were those who died before they made it.

I knew prisoners who never went to take a shower because they were afraid that gas would come out of the pipes instead of water (1). And, then, during the weekly inspection by the nurses of the Block, lice were found on them. Then they had to go through a disinfection treatment that killed them.

I also knew prisoners who never went to the infirmary. They were afraid of being used as guinea pigs of some kind in the medical experiments that rumor had said were being conducted by the S.S. or of being given poison injections. Consequently, they held out and held out against all advice, and one evening a *Kommando* brought their corpses back to the camp.

At Dora, no medical experiments were performed on the prisoners, and poison injections were not administered, at least not to the common prisoners. Generally, in all of the camps, injections of poison were not used against the general run of the prisoners, but they were used on occasion by one of the two *H-Führung* cliques against the other; the "greens" used this method as an elegant means of getting rid of a "red" whose star they saw was rising in the eyes of the S.S. staff, or the other way around.

* * * * *

A fortunate circumstance allowed me to get into the *Revier* on April 8, 1944. For fifteen days I had been dragging around the camp with a feverish body that was visibly swelling.

The swelling had begun in the ankles. "*Ich auch, Bloder Hund!*" my *Kapo* said, "*du bist verrueckt! Geh mal zu Revier!*" (You you're crazy! Get on to the *Revier*!) And, he punctuated this order with several fist blows. It was April 3rd.

At the *Revier* I was caught in the mob. After waiting for an hour my turn came to go before the doctor.

"You have only 37.8° (99°F), impossible to hospitalize you; three days of *Schonung*. Rest stretched out in the Block with your legs up, it will go away. If it doesn't go away, come back again."

As for the rest, for three days I was put at Block cleaning by the merciless *Stubendienst*. At the end of the period I presented myself again in a noticeably worse state.

Of course you will have to be hospitalized, the doctor said to me, but there are only three vacant places and there are at least three hundred of you, some of them worse off than you are. Another three days of *Schonung*, then come back...

I began to have a presentiment of the crematory. With resignation, I went back to the Block where my first parcel was waiting for me, thanks to which I got the *Stubendienst* to allow me to stretch out on my bed instead of making me work.

On April 8, when my turn came, a package of Gauloise cigarettes got me among the three or four chosen ones. And what was bad about it was that I saw nothing irregular in the bribe.

Before getting to the bed assigned me, I still had to leave at the entrance my clothes and my shoes, which were naturally stolen while I was there, and to go under an individual shower which a Polish *Kalifaktor* kept just as cold as he could.

The shower was the last thing that had to be done. It was supposed to be hot, but when it was not a Czech or a Pole, or a German, the *Kalifaktor* swore to heaven that the thing was out of order. The number of those hospitalized for pneumonia or pleurisy who died of that treatment is incalculable.

I was in the *Revier* six times: from April 8th to the 27th; from May 5th to August 30th; from September 7th to October 2nd; from October 10th to November 3rd; from November 6th to December 23rd; and from March 10, 1945 to the liberation. At the first, I lost track of Fernand, who was sent in transport to Ellrich where he died. I was sick that fact was quite plain. In fact, I was gravely ill because I still have not fully recovered, but...

* * * * *

Life in the *Revier* was regulated in detail. We were up at half past five every day, one hour later than the reveille of the rest of the camp. Then came the washing: no matter what the reason was for one's hospitalization, with a fever of 40°C (104°F.) or 37°C (98.5°F), one had to get up, go to the sink, wash, and, on returning, one had to make one's bed. In principle, the *Pfleger* and the *Kalifaktor* were supposed to help those who could not do it themselves, but, with rare exceptions, they simply got the patients to do the chores themselves, with the help of blows. With these chores done, the *Pfleger* took temperatures, while the *Kalifaktor* washed down the ward with a hose.

At about seven o'clock, the Block doctor went among the beds, looked at the temperature charts, heard the comments of the *Pfleger*, the complaints of the sick, said a word to each one, and gave orders for particular treatment or medicines that were to be administered during the day. If he was not Polish, German or Czech, the doctor was usually a good and understanding man. Perhaps, he trusted the *Pfleger* a little too much, with the latter treating the sick according to their political views, their nationality their profession or trade, or their generosity with the parcels that they received. Nevertheless, the doctor very rarely allowed himself to be influenced in a bad sense. Rather, his decisions were almost always well intended.

Once in a while someone who was very sick would dare to ask him, "*Krematorium?*" The doctor might answer: "*Ja, sicher... Drei, vier Tage*". ("Yes, that's certain... in three or four days.") There was a laugh. He then went on without any consideration of

the effect that his reply had on the one concerned. After he finished with the last bed, he left the ward; it was all over. He would not be seen again until the next day.

At nine o'clock, the distribution of medicine. It went very fast since the medicine was generally either rest or diet. From time to time, an aspirin or pyramidon was given out very parsimoniously.

At eleven, soup. The *Pfleger* and the *Kalifaktor* ate heartily, served themselves at each issuance and gave the remainder to the sick. It wasn't too bad; there was enough left over to give an honest regulation helping to everyone, with even a little supplement for one's friends.

In the afternoon, a nap until four o'clock, after which lots of talk until the temperatures were taken and the lights put out. The conversations were only interrupted when our attention was drawn to a long line of cadavers which, right under our windows, the *Totenkommando* people were carrying to the crematorium.

Some favored ones, of which I was one, received parcels: they were a little more pilfered than in the camp because they had to go through another pair of hands before they reached the addressee. The tobacco they contained was not replaced; that was deposited at the entrance, but the *Pfleger* were obliging, and with a good hand-out, a fair share, one could also get one's tobacco and permission to smoke secretly. In the same way, by sharing the rest, the *Pfleger* could be gotten to hike-up the temperature readings, and one's stay in the *Revier* was prolonged.

In summer, the afternoon siesta took place in the open air under the beech trees. The *Kommandos* working inside the camp looked at us with envy, and we grew apprehensive of the time when we would be cured and back among them.

* * * * *

In October 1944, only very rarely were diarrhetics admitted to the *Revier*. Every night they came to Block 16, and they were stuffed with charcoal and sent back. Sometimes the trouble disappeared, but it also persisted beyond the calculated eight days and was complicated by some kind of a fever, and then they were hospitalized with all sorts of conjectures as to what it was.

They were collected in Block 17, Ward 8, whose *Pfleger* was the Russian, Ivan, who said that he was a "*Docent*" on the medical faculty at Karkhov, and whose *Kalifaktor* was the Pole, Stadjeck. Ward 8 was the hell of the *Revier*. Every day it supplied two, three or four corpses to the crematorium.

For every diarrhetic admitted, the doctor prescribed, in addition to the charcoal, a supervised diet: very little to eat, if possible nothing at all, and nothing to drink. He advised Ivan to give nothing the first day, to divide a quart of soup among two or three the next, and so on; a return to a normal diet being determined by the disappearance of the sickness. But Ivan considered that he was there as *Pfleger* to take care of himself and not the sick men: to look after them was work too hard for him,

and, in any case, out of place in a concentration camp. He found it simpler to administer the absolute diet, to divide with Stadjek the rations of the patients, to feed themselves amply, and to do some bartering with the rest. The poor men had nothing to eat, absolutely nothing. On the third day with very rare exceptions, they were in such a state that they could no longer get up, and they had to take care of their needs right where they were, since Stadjek had other things to do than to bring them the bedpan when they asked for it. From that moment on they were doomed...

Stadjek started to inspect very carefully the bed of the unfortunate man to whom he had just refused to bring a basin. All of a sudden he got the smell and went into a rage. He began by giving the offender a good beating, pulled him out of bed, pushed him to the adjoining lavatory, and there gave him a good cold shower since the *Revier* must always be a clean place and patients who didn't want to wash themselves, well, they had to be washed Then shouting out curses, Stadjek took off the sheet and cover from the bed and changed the straw mattress. Hardly stretched out again the patient would be seized with grips, would ask for the bedpan again which was again refused, would discharge in the bed, and would be taken once more to the cold shower, and so on and on. Usually, twenty-four hours later, the patient was dead.

From morning to night the cries and pleadings of the poor men who were put under the cold shower by the Pole, Stadjek, could be heard. Two or three times the *Kapo* or a doctor happened to pass near during this operation. They opened the door; Stadjek explained, "*Er hat sein Bett ganz beschiessen... Dieser Bloder Hund ist so faul... Keine Warme Wasser.*" (He completely dirtied his bed the stupid dog is so lazy... and there is no warm water.) The *Kapo* or the doctor would close the door again and go away without saying a word. The explanation was, of course, unassailable: those patients unable to wash themselves had to be washed, and when there was no hot water...

In the *Revier* one was kept pretty well informed about the way the war was going. German newspapers, in particular the *Völkischer Beobachter*, were delivered, and everyone regularly listened to the radio. Of course there was only official news, but that came rapidly, and that was something.

We also knew what was going on in the other camps; the poor men who had already been through two or three camps before ending up at Dora, recounted the whole day long the experiences they had lived through. That was how we learned about the horrors of Sachsenhausen, Auschwitz, Mauthausen, Oranienburg, etc. And, that was also how we learned that there were very decent camps.

In August, for ten days, the German, Helmuth, was my bed neighbor. He had come straight from Lichtenfeld near Berlin. There were 900 in that camp, and under *Wehrmacht* guard they carried on the work of clearing the bombed suburbs: twelve hours of work, as everywhere, but three meals a day, and three good meals (soup, meat, vegetables, often wine), no *Kapos*, and no *H-Führung*, consequently no beatings. A hard life, but bearable. One day they asked for specialists: since Helmuth was a fitter, he stood up; he was sent to the Dora Tunnel, where they put rock drilling equipment in his hands. Eight days later he was spitting blood.

Before that, I had next to me a prisoner who had spent a month at Wieda, and who had told me that the 1,500 occupants were not too badly off. Naturally, they worked and had little to eat, but they led a kind of family life: on Sunday afternoons, the villagers came to dance at the outskirts of the camp to the music of the prisoners accordions, exchanged friendly small talk with them, and even brought them things to eat. It seems that that did not last; when the S. S. noticed it, Wieda became as hard and as inhuman as Dora.

But, most of those who came from other camps had only hair-raising things to tell, and the accounts of Ellrich were the most horrifying. They were in an incredible state when they arrived among us, and just one look at them was enough to prove that they were inventing nothing... In speaking of bad concentration camps, Buchenwald, Dachau, and Auschwitz are cited, and that is an injustice: in 1944-1945, it was Ellrich that was the worst of all. There, one was without a billet, not given clothing, not fed, without a *Revier*, and all the work consisted of digging under the supervision of the scum of the "greens", the "reds", and the S.S.

It was in the *Revier* that I got acquainted with Jacques Gallier, called Jacky, clown at Medrano. He was as tough as they came. When anyone complained of the hardships of camp life, he invariably answered, "Me, you know, I've done two and a half years at Calvi: I'm used to it." And he went on, "Listen, at Calvi, it was just the same, same work, never enough food, only we didn't get hit so much, but there were irons and solitary, so..." (2)

Champale, the sailor from the Black Sea who had done five years at Clairvaux, didn't contradict him, and as for me, who had earlier witnessed the life of the Joyeux in Africa, I wondered if they weren't right.(3)

* * * * *

On December 23rd I left the *Revier* with the firm intention never to set foot there again. Several things had happened.

In July, Proell gave himself a shot in the arm of potassium cyanide. No one ever found out why, but rumor had it that he had been just about to be arrested and was in danger of being hanged for conspiracy. He was replaced by Heinz, the Communist blacksmith.

Heinz was a brute. One day he caught a fever-case, who had been forbidden any water, in the act of moistening his lips, and he beat him up so hard that he died as a result. He was said to be capable of everything: in the surgery Block, he undertook an appendicitis operation -- without the surgeon in charge, the Czech Cespiva, knowing about it. The story was told that in the first days of the *Revier*, under the rule of the "green" *Kapo*, he had given his attentions to an Algerian whose arm had been crushed between two carts in the Tunnel: he disjoined the shoulder, just as a butcher does with a ham, and instead of anesthetizing the victim, he first beat him up with his fists... A year later, the whole *Revier* still resounded with the wails of the unfortunate fellow.

Lots of other things were told, too. The patients never felt safe with him. As far as I was concerned, one day at the end of September, he came near my bed with Cespiva,

and he decided that to cure me, the right kidney would have to be removed. I at once begged one of my comrades, who had another disease, to give a urine specimen for me, and thus got a negative analysis, which allowed me, as I had wanted, to be sent back to the *Kommando*. Being incapable of doing the work, I presented myself at the *Revier* a few days later -- just time enough for the storm to have passed -- and I got in easily.

Everything went well until December, at which date Heinz was arrested, in his turn, for conspiracy, like his predecessor, and he was replaced by a Pole. Caught in the same net by the S.S. were Cespiva, a certain number of *Pfleger*, among them the lawyer Boyer from Marseille, and some others from the camp. We never learned why about this either, but it is probable that it was for having circulated news about the war which they said they got from foreign broadcasts, listed to in secret, and which the S.S. considered subversive.

With the new *Kapo*, the *Revier* was overrun with Poles, and new doctors were put at the head of the Blocks, ours was an illiterate Pole. When he arrived, he decided that nephritis was caused by bad teeth, and gave an order to have all the teeth of all the nephritis cases pulled. The dentist was sent for at once and began to carry out the order without knowing what it was about, but showing his astonishment and protesting. In order to save my teeth, I arranged once more to get out of the *Revier* with a paper which certified me for *leichte Arbeit* (light labor). An exceptionally favorable set of circumstances occurred which made it possible for me to serve as the *Schwung* (batman) to the S.S. *Oberscharführer* who was in charge of the company of guard dogs which patrolled the perimeter of the camp. I found that the camp had changed considerably when I got back.

FOOTNOTES

(1) The gas chambers which some of the S.S. denied existed and which others attested to with the logic of Mme Simone de Beauvoir did not exist at Dora. Nor did they exist at Buchenwald. I note in passing that of all those who so minutely described the horrors of this form of execution (which, incidentally, is a perfectly legitimate form of execution in the United States) not one was an eyewitness, as far as I know. The only possible exceptions are Rudolf Höss, Miklos Nyiszli, and Kurt Gerstein. The former was *Lagerkommandant* at Auschwitz; his testimony is unreliable both on the grounds of the atrocious conditions under which it was written down and of the fantastic circumstances under which it was published, as will be discussed further on in this book. The testimony of the latter two is obviously false, a fact which will be discussed in the following chapters.

(2) For a comparison of prison life in French prisons -- during about the same period - - I have included four descriptions which are found in Appendix A at the end of this book.

(3) In *La Lie de la Terre*, Arthur Koestler gives a picture of the life in a French concentration camp which confirms my point of view. (The first book in English by

Koestler : *Scum of the Earth*, London, Jonathan Cape, 1941) Another account which also confirms my view is that of Julien Blanc under the title *Joyeux, fais ton fourbi*.

Chapter Six

Shipwreck

What happened next is of not great interest.

In December 1944 Dora was a large camp. It was no longer a satellite of Buchenwald, but, rather Ellrich, Osterrod, Harzungen, and Illfed, all in the construction stage, were dependents of it (1). Convoys of prisoners arrived there directly, just as they had earlier at Buchenwald, where they were disinfected, numbered, and divided up among the satellite camps. The numbers that the new prisoners wore now were beyond the 100,000's...

Every night, trucks brought back corpses from the satellite camps to be burned in the crematorium.

Block 172 was finished; there was a movie theater, as well as a library, functioning for the people of the *H-Führung* and their protégés; the women who had been installed for several months in the brothel also served their needs. The Blocks were comfortable; there was running water; and there were even radios! The beds were set up, without sheets but with straw mattresses and with blankets. The period of great hurry was over; the S.S. were less exacting; their object, which was to get the camp set up, had been accomplished. But, on the other hand, they paid more attention to the political life, got excited about all sorts of imaginary conspiracies, and hunted out acts of sabotage, which, indeed, were real and numerous.

All of these material betterments, nevertheless, did not bring the general mass of prisoners the welfare that might have been expected. The mentality of the *H-Führung* had not changed. It was as though the prisoner bureaucracy tried to make us live the life of savages, but in buildings instead of caves, so hard did they try to retain the atmosphere of the *Straflager* along with its hardships and cruelties.

During the night of December 23-24, some *Kommando*, motivated by cudgels, set up on the grounds a gigantic Christmas fir tree, the erection of which was completed by five thirty the next morning in time for the roll-call before leaving for work and which was resplendent with multi-colored lights. From that day on and until Epiphany we had to listen every night at roll-call to *O Tannenbaum*, played by the *Musikkommando*, before breaking ranks . . . One was obliged to listen with evident enjoyment or one risked getting hit.

Concerning the matter of prisoner welfare, two unexpected elements had to be considered: the joint advance of the Russians and of the English and Americans forced the evacuation of the camps in the East and the West and the transfer of prisoners to Dora and the more and more intensive bombing from the air that interrupted the normal flow of supplies into the camp.

After January 1945 there was no end to the convoys that arrived; often the prisoners were in an indescribable state. The camp which was planned to hold about 15,000 persons sometimes had 50,000 and more. They were bunked two or three to a bed. There was no more bread since flour was no longer delivered. Instead, one got two or three tiny potatoes. The ration of margarine and sausage was cut in half. As the storehouses were emptied as a consequence of the increased population and of the bombings, only a pint of soup instead of a quart, was distributed. There was no more clothing to replace what could no longer be used; Berlin was unable to send more. No more shoes; one made the best of the old ones. And, the same shortages existed with everything else.

On the work level, the whole camp became riddled with sabotage. Raw materials no longer arrived at the Tunnel, and the work was slowed. It was winter. It was useless to ask for window glass to replace what was broken because there was not any to be had: but any prisoner could secretly steal a pane at the Tunnel. There wasn't any paint, either. The Block Chief who needed some had it stolen from a Zawatsky warehouse by one of his protégés. One day there was no electric wire for the V1 and V2 rockets; all of the prisoners who were working in the Tunnel had stolen a yard each to use for shoelaces. Another time, a supplementary stretch of railroad track was to be laid down. For at least a year, the necessary wooden ties had been there, piled up around the station. The *S.S.-Führung* supposed they were still there and gave the order to build the line since they had no choice. It was noticed then that the ties had disappeared, and an investigation revealed that at the beginning of winter the civilian workers had had them sawed up one by one by the prisoners and had taken them away little by little in their *Rucksacks* to supplement the shortage in their fuel rations. A few persons were punished, more ties were requested, and a few days later some gyroscopes were received.

In the Tunnel the acts of sabotage were beyond counting. It took the S.S. months to catch on to the fact that the Russians were making a large number of V1 and V2 rockets perfectly useless by urinating over the wireless equipment. The Russians were master pillagers, and master saboteurs, and they were stubborn; nothing stopped them. They also made up the largest contingent of those hanged. But this was for another reason: they thought they had worked out a plan of escape ...

Very few prisoners had any idea of escaping from Dora, and those who tried it were all recovered by the dogs. Once back in camp they were usually hanged, not for the attempted escape, but for a war crime, since it was rare indeed that they could not be charged with some theft or other crime in one of the places that they had gone through...

Sabotage seems to have extended into even very high circles: the V1 and V2 rockets, before being used, had to be tested, and those that were not right were sent to Harzungen to be dismantled and checked. At Harzungen, they were dismantled, and the various defective parts were put into special packing cases which were then sent back again to Dora where they were assembled again in the same improper way. As a consequence, there were always about thirty V1 and V2 rockets that were being shuttled back and forth between Harzungen, Dora and the testing place.

Even the administration at Dora was snowed under in confusion. At the entrance to the Tunnel, there was a sort of stockroom where all the parts that could not be used were collected: nuts, bolts, pieces of sheet-metal, screws of all kinds! etc. A special *Kommando*, detailed for light work, was in charge of sorting all these pieces: into one box went the bolts, into another the screws, in a third the odds and ends of sheet-metal. When all of the boxes were full, the *Kapo* would give the order to empty them all together into a rail car. When the car was full, it was attached to a train which went off to an unknown destination; then, two days later it ended up at the entrance at Ellrich where it had been sent to be unloaded and sorted. The *Kommando* in charge of this work at Ellrich sent to the storeroom at Dora all of the pieces that they had sorted out and had dumped in a heap. Thus was a whole lot of scraps being endlessly sorted at the opposite ends of the Tunnel. And so, from incident to incident, from bombings to diminishing food supplies, from virtual conspiracies to sabotage and hangings, we reached the liberation.

During all this period I lived as batman to the *Oberscharführer* in command of the company of dogs; it was easy work which included the polishing of his boots, the brushing of his uniforms, the making of his bed, the keeping of his room and his office meticulously clean, and the fetching of his meals from the S.S. canteen. Every morning at about eight my stint was done. I spent the rest of the time talking here and there, warming myself near the fire, reading newspapers, and listening to the T.S.F. When the S.S. cook gave me food for my *Oberscharführer* at each meal, he surreptitiously gave me just as much for myself. In addition, the thirty S.S. men who lived in the Block gave me various jobs from time to time; they had me wash their mess kits, wax their boots, sweep out their rooms, etc... In return, they gave me their leftovers, which every night I took to friends. It was the good life.

This direct contact with the S.S. personnel made me see them in quite a different light than that in which they were universally seen in the camp. There was no possible comparison: in public they were brutes; taken individually, they were lambs. They looked at me with curiosity, they asked questions; then spoke on familiar terms with me; they wanted to know how I thought the war would turn out and took my opinion seriously. They were all men -- former miners, factory workers, plasterers -- who had been unemployed in 1933 and who the regime had taken out of their misery by giving them what they thought of as a bridge of gold. They were simple, and their intellectual level was extremely low. In exchange for the well-being that the regime had brought them, they carried out its more ignoble deeds and were at peace with their consciences, with morality, with the German fatherland, and with humanity. Although they were very sensitive to the bad luck that had befallen me when I was sent to Dora, they nevertheless, went among the prisoners in their charge with their heads high, haughty, unbending and without pity. Not once did the idea occur to them that the other prisoners were people like themselves, or even ... like me!

The anomalies in the administration were not generally obvious to them, and when by chance they did notice them, they quite sincerely attributed them to the *H-Führung* (2) or to the general prisoner population. They did not understand how we could be so thin, so weak, so dirty, and so badly clothed. The Third Reich, after all, had furnished us with everything we needed: food, everything necessary to keep us perfectly clean, comfortable lodging in a camp as modern as possible, health recreations, music, lectures, sports, a Christmas tree, and so forth. And we did not know how to take

advantage of it. That was proof that Hitler was right and that, with very rare exceptions, we belonged to a physically and morally inferior part of humanity! The idea never occurred to them that they might be responsible as individuals for the wrongs that were done under their eyes, or with their cooperation, unconscious or active. They were victims of the environment -- of that special environment -- in which, while breaking collectively with the restraints of tradition, all peoples, without distinction as to regime or nationality, founder periodically.

On March 10th, a group of female *Bibelforscher* (Baptists, Jehovah's Witnesses, and conscientious objectors) arrived at Dora, followed by an order from Berlin stipulating that these women -- there were twenty-four of them -- were to be put to light work. Henceforth, the *Schwung* work was turned over to them. I was removed and sent back to camp. To escape a bad *H-Führung Kommando*, I thought it wiser to take advantage of my state of health and to get hospitalized in the *Revier*; from the hospital windows I watched the bombardment of Nordhausen on April 3 and 5, 1945, two days before being taken in the evacuation transport, the account of which is included in the Prologue.

FOOTNOTES

(1) The *Häftlingsführung* of these satellite camps was in the hands of the "greens" which the "red" *H-Führung* of Dora sent there to get rid of them and to prevent their return to power.

(2) The majority of the prisoners also felt that the *H-Führung* was much more to blame than was the S.S. for the kind of life that they were forced to lead.

PART II The Experience of Others

Chapter Seven Concentration Camp Literature

When the time came for me to draw a parallel between my own experience and that of others, as they described it, I found myself in a state of mind which the reader will easily understand.

While we were in the camp, all of our conversations during rare moments of respite, were centered around three things: when the war was likely to end and our individual or collective chances of surviving to see that end, the food that we were going to eat after we were freed, and what might be called camp "gossip," although the word "gossip" seems inappropriate in view of the tragic reality of camp life. None of these topics offered much possibility for escaping from the actual situation of the moment. All three, on the other hand, separately or collectively, depending on the amount of time that we had to discuss them, brought us right back to the present with the use of a phrase like, "When we tell them about that..." said with such a tone and such a sinister look that it frightened me. Recognizing that I was powerless to do anything about these pangs of conscience, given the atmosphere of the place, I retired within myself and became an obstinately silent witness.

Instinctively I recalled the aftermath of the First World War: the veterans, their stories and all of their writings. There was no doubt in my mind that the coming post-war period would have, in addition, veteran prisoners and deportees who would go back to their homes with even more horrible memories than those of veteran soldiers. But, instead of merely telling their stories, the way seemed to be open for these veterans to vent their feelings in a spirit of hatred and vengeance. To the extent that I was able to distinguish my personal lot in the great drama that was being played, all the Montagues, all the Capulets, all the Armagnacs, and all the Burgundians of history, taking up all their quarrels from the beginning, began to dance, before my eyes in a frenzied saraband, on a stage enlarged to the size of Europe. I could not convince myself that the spirit of hatred, being kindled before my eyes, would be harnessed no matter how the conflict came out.

When I tried to envision the consequences of this smoldering hatred and when I remembered that I had a son, I had to ask myself whether it would not be better if no one returned. And, I even hoped that the higher authorities of the Third Reich would realize in time that they could only be pardoned by offering, in a gigantic and frightful holocaust, all that remained of the inmates in the camps, as a redemption for so much evil. In that state of mind, I had decided that if I ever got back from the camps, that I

would practice what I preached, and I swore never to make the slightest reference to my experience in the camps.

For what seemed to me to be a very long time after my return to France, I stuck to my decision; but it was not easy to do.

First, I had to struggle against a natural inclination to want to tell my story. For example, I shall never forget a demonstration that in the very first days, the deportees had arranged at Belfort to mark their return. The whole town had gathered itself together to listen to their message. The great hall of the *Maison du Peuple* was full to bursting. Outside the square was thronged with people. Loud-speakers even had to be set up out in the street. My health did not permit me to be present at this demonstration, either as a speaker or listener, and I was very disappointed. But, my disappointment was even greater the next day when the local papers reported all that had been said; it was impossible to discern any statement of objectivity. My apprehensions about the hate-filled and distorted stories of the camp veterans had been confirmed. The crowd, however, was not fooled; never again could the same mass of people be gathered together for such a purpose.

I had also to struggle against others. Wherever I went, over a glass of wine or a cup of tea, there was always a distinguished parrot in the grip of emotion, who was discussing the deportation, or a well-wishing friend who thought he was doing me a favor by drawing attention to me by turning the conversation to the subject: "Is it true that?" "Do you think ...?" "What do you think of the book by ...?" All these questions irritated me. When they were not inspired by a perverse curiosity, they betrayed an uncertainty and a need to be reassured. Systematically I cut the talk short, a practice which sometimes provoked severe criticism.

I resented such criticism, and I blamed it upon my fellow deportees and their never ending publication of their stories, often imaginary, in which they gave themselves the airs of saints, heroes, or martyrs. As their writings collected on my desk like so many entreaties, I was sure that the time was coming when I would be forced to abandon my reserve and to relate my memories of my experiences as a deportee. Hence, I was not surprised when more than once I thought that the saying, attributed to Riera, that after every war all of the veterans should be killed without pity, was more than just a clever remark.

Then one day I realized that a false picture of the German camps had been created and that the problem of the concentration camps was a universal one, not just one that could be disposed of by placing it on the doorstep of the National Socialists. The deportees -- many of whom were Communists -- had been largely responsible for leading international political thinking to such an erroneous conclusion. I suddenly felt that by remaining silent I was an accomplice to a dangerous influence. And, at one sitting, without paying attention to literary style and in as simple as possible a form, I wrote my *Le Passage de la ligne* in an attempt to put things into proper perspective and in an attempt to bring people back to a sense of objectivity and, at the same time, to a better conception of intellectual honesty.

Next, the idea occurred to me that future discussions about the problem of concentration camps would benefit by starting with a general reconsideration of those

things that were attributed to the German camps, drawn from the mass of testimonies that former prisoners have brought forth. As a consequence, I have gathered together the first elements of this reconsideration. This is the explanation and the justification for the *Regard sur la Littérature concentrationnaire* (Survey of concentration camp literature) which is found in Chapters Eight through Eleven.

* * * *

The experience of the ex-service men, still so fresh from the 1914 war, offers another parallel which I believe to be pertinent. They came back with a great desire for peace, swearing by all the saints that they would do everything possible to achieve it: that this was the "war to end all wars." They were shown gratitude, appreciation and a certain admiration. With joy, hope, and enthusiasm, the whole French nation received them with affection and confidence.

On the eve of the 1939 war, however, their opinions were very much questioned. Their experiences and the lessons from them were fully commented on in various ways, and the best that one can say is that public opinion was not kind to them. It sneered at their public statements, saying that they were in their dotage -- that was the word used -- and that their memories crowded into every conversation. The leaders of the national veteran associations, whose mission seemed to be limited to demands for fatter pensions were also criticized. Concerning the writings of the veterans, public opinion was just as categorical, and there was only one testimonial that it would acknowledge: *Le Feu* by Barbusse. When, in rare moments of good will, public opinion made an exception, it was for Galtier-Boissière and for Dorgelès, but on other grounds: for the mocking obdurate pacifism of the one, and what it thought was the realism of the other.

Who can say what the real reasons were for this reversal of opinion? As I see it, the reasons all belong within the framework of this general truth: men are much more preoccupied with the future that they face than they are with the past from which there is nothing more to be gained. Consequently it is impossible to center people's lives around any event, no matter how extraordinary, especially a war, a phenomenon which tends to become commonplace and whose particular characteristics very rapidly become obsolete.

On the eve of 1914, my grandfather, who had not yet digested the war of 1870, used to talk about it interminably to my father, who yawned with boredom. On the eve of 1939, my father had not yet finished telling about his war, and, every time that he brought it up, I could not help thinking that Du Guesclin, rising up among us, full of pride in his deeds with his cross-bow, could hardly have been more ridiculous.

Thus are generations opposed to each other in their ideas. They are also opposed in their interests. Between the two wars, the rising generations had the feeling that it was impossible for them to make any attempt to realize their own destiny without coming up against the ex-service men, their pretensions, and their preferential rights. They had been given "rights over us." And they took advantage of it and kept pressing for more. But, there are rights which even the fact of having suffered through a long war

and having won it, do not confer, particularly that of being the only ones fit to construct a peace, or, more modestly, the right to positions regardless of merit, whether they be in a tobacconist's shop, in a rural police station, or in a teaching post.

The divorce between the public and the veterans took place during the economic crisis of the Thirties. The rift was aggravated, about 1935, when the veterans forgot about the vows that they had made on their return from the battlefield and so easily accepted the possibility of another war, and when, at the same time, the public sentiment was for peace. It is another law of historical evolution that the young generations are pacifist, that through them, over the centuries, humanity progressively becomes firmer in its search for universal peace, and that war is always, in a certain measure, the rancor of old age.

In any case, there is one thing due the ex-service men of that war as well as of the last one: they told about their wars as they were. Almost every word, to read them or to listen to them, rings profoundly true, or, at least convincing. But this cannot be said of the deportees.

The deportees came back with hatred and resentment on their tongues and in their pens. They were not tired of war; rather they had an axe to grind and they demanded vengeance. Moreover, since they suffered from an inferiority complex -- there were only some 30.000 of them out of a population of 40 million inhabitants -- they wantonly created a story of horror for a public that always clamored for something more sensational in order the more surely to inspire pity and recognition.

The inflammatory fabrications of one deportee soon inspired similar stories by others, and they progressively were caught on a treadmill of lies. Although some deportees were duped by others in this process, most of them managed quite consciously to blacken the picture even more in their zeal to hold the limelight. So it was with Ulysses who, during the course of his voyage, each day added a new adventure to his Odyssey, as much to please the public taste of the times as to justify his long absence in the eyes of his family. But, if Ulysses succeeded in creating his own legend and in fixing the attention of twenty-five centuries of history on it, it is no exaggeration to say that the deportees failed to do so.

Everything was fine for the deportees during the very first days of the Liberation. One could not, without risk of being branded a "collaborator" question what they had to say, even if one would have felt like it. But slowly, the truth took its revenge. With the passage of time, with a return to freedom of speech, and with conditions more and more normal, it burst forth into the light. For example, one could write, sure of expressing the common uneasiness and of not being incorrect, that "Travelers from afar can lie with impunity... I have read many accounts by the deportees and always I felt the reserve, or the pressure. Even David Rousset, at moments, misleads us; he explains too much." (From a letter by Abbé Marius Perrin published in *Le Pays Roannais*, 27 October 1949), or that "*La dernière étape* is an imbecilic film that amounts to nothing." (From a letter by Robert Pernot published in *Paroles françaises*, 27 November 1949.)

It was fifteen years before the military veteran of World War Two lost prestige in the eyes of the public; it took less than four years for the deportees. Except for that

difference, their political destiny was the same. Such is the importance of truth in history.

* * * *

I would like to cite a personal story which is typical in that it shows the relative worth which one must accord to all accounts in general.

The scene takes place in a law court, in the fall of 1945. A woman is seated on the defendant's bench. The Resistance, which suspected her of collaboration, had not succeeded in killing her before the arrival of the Americans. Her husband, however, fell in a burst of machine gun fire, at the corner of a dark street one night in the winter of 1945. I never learned what the couple actually did, although I had heard, before my own arrest, the most improbable tales. In order to get to the bottom of it, I went to the hearing.

There is not much in her record. The witnesses are the more numerous and the more merciless. The principal one among them is a deportee, a former group leader of the local Resistance -- so he says! The judges are plainly embarrassed by the accusations whose substance seems to them to be very questionable.

The principal witness arrives. He explains that members of his group had been informed against to the Germans and that it could only have been by the accused and her husband who lived in their circle and knew their activities. He adds that he himself has seen the accused in friendly, possibly amatory, conversation with an officer of the *Kommandantur*, who lived over a court behind his parents' shop; that they exchanged papers, etc. The defense attorney then begins his cross-examination:

Attorney: "You used to go to this shop then?"

Witness: "Yes, just to keep track of this business."

Attorney: "Can you describe the shop?"

(The witness describes the counter, the shelves, the window at the back, gives the approximate dimensions, etc ...)

Attorney: "It was through the window at the back which looks out on the court that you saw the accused and the officer exchange papers?"

Witness: "Yes."

Attorney: "Then, you can describe just where they were when you saw them, and where you were in the shop?"

Witness: "The two of them were at the foot of a stairway which led to the officer's room, the accused with her elbows on the railing, and the other one very near her ..."

Attorney: "That's enough. (Turning to the court and holding a paper) Your Honor, there is no spot from which the stairway in question can be seen: here is a floor plan of the place drawn up by a draftsman."

(The Chief Judge examines the document, passes it to his colleagues, and admits the evidence.)

Chief Judge: "Do you adhere to your statement?"

Witness: "Well, that is ... It wasn't I who saw ... It was one of my agents who gave me the report at my request ..."

Chief Judge: "You may step down."

The rest of the affair has no importance at all, since the witness was not arrested on the spot for perjury and since the accused, having admitted that she had attended some courses at the Franco-German Institute, which, as she said, brought about a certain number of friendly relationships between herself and certain officers of the *Kommandantur*, was in the end sentenced to a term in prison for a number of things in which she was only implicated.

Even if the witness had been cross-examined further, such questioning would probably have revealed that the agent he claimed to have sent to make a report was non-existent and that his statement consisted of nothing but those "they says" which poison the atmosphere in those small towns where everybody knows everyone else.

It is not my intention to compare all of the writings that have appeared on the German concentration camps to this experience. My only object is to show that some were no better, even among those which were most popular. And that, aside from good or bad faith, there are so many imponderables which influence the witness that, one must always distrust History as it is told, especially when it is still warm.

Les jours de notre Mort, which established the prodigious talent of David Rousset, and which is discussed further in Chapter Ten, is, for example, a collection of the "they says" which ran through all of the camps and which could never be verified. It is upon this kind of questionable testimony that the author has culled the facts upon which he bases his particular interpretation. In this present work, which is concerned with truth and not with virtuosity, no extracts from it will be found.

In 1950, I put the witnesses who had testified as to their experiences in the concentration camps into three categories: first, those who were not intellectually able to be careful witnesses, or accurate observers, and whom I called, without any

pejorative intention, minor witnesses, second, the psychologists, victims of a bias, to my mind a little too subjective; and, third, the sociologists, or those claiming to be. I had found no historians, at least none worthy of the name.

On guard, so as not to fall into the error for which I was blaming others of talking about things a little too removed from my own experience, I deliberately gave up presenting a complete list of concentration camp literature of the time. Moreover, the number of witnesses was necessarily limited in each of the above-mentioned categories so as to keep this study in a manageable form: three minor witnesses (Abbé Robert Ploton; Frère Birin of the Ecoles chrétiennes d'Epernay; and Abbé Jean-Paul Renard); a psychologist (David Rousset); and a sociologist (Eugen Kogon). In addition, there is a witness who defies classification: Louis Martin-Chauffier. With the exception of one of them, their experiences had to do with the same camps where I had been imprisoned.

Since 1950, sustained and encouraged by the political policies which underpin the so-called "cold-war," concentration literature, which in turn supports those policies, has only grown and blossomed. For example it is no secret that there are certain features of the foreign policy of the United States which are expressly designed to prevent any serious breakdown of relations with the Soviet Union; the contrived danger of a re-birth of Naziism and Fascism in Europe is one of them. Both Stalin and Truman fully exploited this myth, the former to keep Europe from achieving economic and political unity and from integrating Germany into such a European community, and the latter to justify in part the huge cost of maintaining an army of occupation in Germany. And, Khrushchev continues to play the same game that Stalin played with Truman, with Kennedy ... but, with a little less luck?

About 1950, the idea was revived among many Europeans that Europe as -- a political entity--did exist. Formerly brought about by the haunting memory of the Franco-German wars, this pan-Europeanism was this time provoked by another obsession with two complementary aspects: on the one hand, the near certainty that, divided against itself, Europe was an easy prey for Communism; on the other hand, that no United Europe was possible without the integration of Germany. In Moscow and in Tel-Aviv, it was felt, from the first breath of this revival of pan-Europeanism that if it grew into a tempest, it could not fail to end in a united Europe, which would mean the political isolation of Russia and the end of the so-called reparation payments paid out by Germany to Israel. The counter-attack was not long in coming: two attacks, as remarkably synchronized as if they had been planned together ahead of time, were spear-headed by two propaganda organizations, the one with the title *Comité pour la recherche des crimes et des criminels de guerre*, located at Warsaw, and the other called the *World Center of Contemporary Jewish Documentation*, whose two most important branches are in Tel-Aviv and in Paris. The target was Germany. The theme was that the horrors and atrocities that had been committed during the Second World War by the Nazis were a natural vocation of Germany. Therefore, in order to prevent a re-emergence of this horrible propensity, the Germans had to be kept under severe control and very carefully segregated. The first result of this policy of defamation was, so far as I know, the publication of *Documentation sur l'extermination par les gaz* (1950) by Helmut Krausnik; the second, was *Médecin à Auschwitz* (1951) by a certain Dr. Miklos Nyiszli, a Hungarian Jew who was deported to that camp in May 1944, and the third was *Le Bréviaire de la Haine* (1951) by Leon Poliakov. Since then

the deluge has not stopped: every time that the least sign of rapprochement between Germany and the other European countries is seen (e.g., CECA., Common Market, Franco-German Treaty, etc ...) we get with the stamp of the Warsaw Committee or of an important member of the *World Center for Jewish Documentation*, or again, of the Munich *Institut für Zeitgeschichte*, which is associated with the two, a study that each time amounts to an accusation more terrible than the last one. And, each time the world press supports the defamation with a spectacular publicity campaign. Thus have three publications appeared one after the other: *Le Troisième Reich et les Juifs* (1953) by Leon Poliakov and Josef Wulf, *L'Histoire de Joel Brand, un échange de 10,000 camions contre un million de Juifs* (1955); and *Le Lagerkommandant d'Auschwitz parle, Mémoires de Rudolf Höss* (1958). These volumes are among the best known; to cite them all, just a list without commentary would require an entire book. Recently, an anthology of this literature was compiled by a *Comité d'étude de la seconde guerre mondiale*, whose head office is in Paris and among whose directors are a woman by the name of Olga Wormser of the *World Center of Jewish Documentation*, and a renowned unknown, who can put his hand to anything, by the name of Henri Michel. It contains excerpts from 208 author-witnesses, and I can add that it cites only those authors who strictly followed the Zionist and Communist lines because on the shelves of my library there are almost as many books which are not cited, although they are often just as accusatory, often more intelligently, and although they often have the same lack of respect for historical truth. Naturally, I was not included in this anthology which is entitled *La Tragédie de la Déportation* (1962). What makes one despair is that there are historians who are intellectually dishonest enough to support these works with their authority: Labrousse and Renouvin in France, and Rothfels in Germany among others ... From the United States has come Raul Hilberg, whose book, *The Destruction of the European Jews* (1961), is surely the most important of all the works that have been published on the question and the one that has best succeeded in giving the appearance--the appearance only -- of being a serious and objective study. Because of its importance, I have devoted the third section of this work to an examination of *The Destruction of the European Jews*, as well as other historical studies. Finally, to be thorough one should also cite the films, whose purpose is to condition public opinion, that have been taken from this literature: *La Dernière Étape*, *Kapo*, *the Nuremberg Documents*, etc....

The reader may be tempted to place this survey of the concentration camp drama, with regard to its over-all tragic consequences alone, on the human plane, and perhaps to find that I included too much detail. If I point out that the deportation trains from France to Germany carried a hundred persons per car in cars that were intended to hold forty at a maximum, and not a hundred and twenty-five as some have claimed, it will be observed that the fact scarcely mitigates the conditions of the trip. If I point out that a camp bore the name Belsen-Bergen and not Bergen-Belsen, that fact certainly does not alter the lot of those who were interned there. If I claim that the word *Kapo* is derived from the first letters of the German phrase *Konzentrationslager Arbeitpolizei*, instead of coming from the Italian *Il Capo*, that fact does not excuse the brutalities that were committed by the prisoner police. And, the bad working conditions, the hunger, the tortures, etc., whether they took place in one camp or in another, whether the one reporting them saw them or not, whether they were the acts of the S.S. themselves or carried out by the prisoner trustees whom they chose at random from among the inmates, were still inhuman and brutal treatment.

I would like to make the observation, in my turn, that a whole is composed of details, and that an error of detail, whether made in good or bad faith, regardless of whether it is of a kind that is intended to mislead the observer, must logically make the observer doubt the reliability of the whole; and if there are many errors in detail ...? And if they are almost all shown to be made in bad faith ...?

I shall make myself better understood by referring to a news item that filled all of the papers a few years ago. Just before the outbreak of the 1939 war, a foreign student, taking advantage of a momentary distraction on the part of the guards, stole a painting by Watteau called *l'Indifférent* from the Louvre. A few days later the painting was recovered, but the student, in the meantime, had made a slight modification to it: disturbed by that hand raised in a gesture which all of the experts said was something that had been left unfinished by the artist, the student had rested it on a cane that he had added. This cane did nothing to change the figure. On the contrary it harmonized marvelously with the pose. But, it emphasized the figure's indifference, and noticeably changed the interpretation one could place on his reasons for it and his purposes. Moreover, one could argue that quite another interpretation could have been made if, instead of the cane, a pair of gloves had been put into the figure's hand, or if a bouquet of flowers had negligently been dropped from it. In spite of the fact that no one could swear that Watteau had not intended that the cane be included in the picture, the cane was effaced and the painting was put back in its place. If the curators had let the cane remain no one would have noticed anything amiss either in the painting itself or in the general appearance of the painting galleries of the Louvre. But, if, instead of confining himself to correcting *l'Indifférent*, our student had taken it into his head to eliminate all of the enigmas of all of the other paintings, if he had put a velvet mask over the smile of the *Joconde*, rattles in all the outstretched hands of the little Jesuses lying astonished on the knees and in the arms of spell-bound Virgins, spectacles on Erasmus; and if all that had been allowed to remain, one can imagine how all of those little changes would have changed the general appearance of the entire Louvre collection!

The errors that can be found in the testimonies of the deportees are of the same kind as the cane of *l'Indifférent*, without modifying noticeably the picture of the camps, they have falsified the sense of History. Moreover, by taking these errors collectively, the viewer is confronted with a distorted picture of a similar magnitude as if he had gone through the Louvre's collection of paintings, after they had been thoroughly corrected.

The same will hold true for the reader if he will reserve his judgment, both on the secondary works and the documents which I indict and on the conclusions which certain historians who are obviously in the service of a cause, have drawn from them, and if he will ask himself apart from all other considerations whether these documents and interpretations could be upheld in their entirety before a properly constituted court of law, that is, one that is not a kangaroo court like the Nuremberg Tribunal!(1)

FOOTNOTE

(1). [This view is not unique to Paul Rassinier. For example, William O. Douglas, former Associate Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court, observed that he "... thought at the time and still think[s] that the Nuremberg trials were unprincipled. Law was created *ex post facto* to suit the passion and clamor of the time " For additional strong "anti-Nuremberg" views by numerous notables who were in the highest echelons of the Allied governments during World War Two, see, H.K. Thompson, Jr. and Henry Strutz, eds., *Doenitz at Nuremberg: A Re-appraisal* (New York: Amber Publishing, 1976).]

Chapter Eight

The Minor Witnesses

These witnesses recount only what they saw or what they claim to have seen, without much comment. Criticism here pertains only to details, which are often small. While the great enigmas of the concentration camp problem can only be approached through the major witnesses, the others cannot be overlooked.

I. Frère Birin

Frère Birin, whose real name is Alfred Untereiner, published a chronological account of his experiences at Buchenwald and Dora entitled *16 mois de bagne* (Reims: Matot-Braine 1946). In the prologue, he relates the circumstances that led to his arrest and deportation. He was arrested in December 1943, was deported to Buchenwald on January 17, 1944, and was transferred to Dora the following March 13th. We were in the same deportation convoy and in the same transport from Buchenwald to Dora. Our registration numbers were also close together: 43,649 for him, and 44,364 for me.

We were liberated together. But, inside the camp we fared differently. Thanks to the perfect knowledge that he had of the German language, because of his Alsatian origin, he managed to get himself assigned as secretary of the *Arbeitsstatistik* (work statistics office) a particularly privileged position, while I shared the common lot until sickness interrupted. As secretary of the *Arbeitsstatistik*, he rendered innumerable services to a large number of prisoners! Especially to the French. His devotion was without limits. Implicated in a plot which I have always believed was without substance, he was incarcerated in the camp's prison for the last four or five months of his deportation. He is presently teaching, if I am not mistaken, in the Ecoles chrétiennes, at Epernay.

Frère Birin claims that *16 mois de bagne* is a faithful account. "I wish nevertheless only to give an account of what I have seen," writes the author (page 38). Perhaps indeed he believes this quite sincerely. But we shall see how faithful it really is. He writes that in the deportation train from the Compiègne station "They made us get into an '8 chevaux 40 hommes' car... but 125 of us." (page 28)

What really happened when we left the Royallieu camp was this: the guards lined us up in columns of fives and in groups of 100, each group destined for one rail car. Fifteen or twenty sick men had been brought to the station by automobile, and they had a rail car all to themselves. The last group in the long line which that morning was strung out along the streets of Compiègne between heavily armed German soldiers, was short of men. It consisted of some forty persons who were disbursed among all the cars, after all of the complete groups had boarded. We got three in our car which brought our number to one hundred and three. I doubt that there were any special reasons why the car in which Frère Birin found himself should have taken on twenty-

five. At any rate even if that were the case he should in all honesty have shown it to be an exception.

He describes our arrival at Buchenwald as follows:

Everyone arriving had to be disinfected. First of all, the shearings where *ex tempore* barbers, amused at our confusion and at the gashes which in haste or carelessness they gave us, mocked us. Like a flock of sheep shorn of their fleece, the prisoners rushed pell-mell into a big tank of water strongly dosed with Cresyl. Streaked with blood, dirty with filth, this bath served the entire detachment. *Harried with clubs*, heads had to be plunged under the water. At the end of each session, drowned bodies were dragged out of that despicable basin (Page 35, emphasis added)

The reader, not forewarned, will not fail to think that these *ex tempore* barbers who mocked and gashed us were the S.S., and that the clubs that beat the heads were held by the same. Not at all, they were prisoners. And, since the S.S. were absent from this operation, which they only supervised from a distance, no one made the prisoner barbers behave the way they should, have. But, because this detail is omitted, the entire responsibility seems to fall on the S.S. This confusion, which I shall not point out again, is maintained all through the book, and in the same way.

Concerning the camp schedule, Frère Birin writes:

Very early rising, food clearly insufficient for twelve hours of work: one liter of soup, two to two hundred and fifty grams of bread, twenty grams of margarine. (Page 40)

Why did he forget, or neglect to mention, the half-liter of coffee each morning and night, and the round of sausage or the spoon of cheese or jam which regularly came with the margarine? The fact that the food was insufficient would not have been lessened and the honesty of the information given would have suffered less. He then goes on to say:

Since March, twelve hundred French, I among them were designated for an unknown designation. Before our departure we were issued convict's clothes, striped blue and white: *Jacket and trousers* only which could not protect us from the cold. (Page 41, emphasis added.)

I was in that convoy. Everyone was issued, in addition an overcoat. If this clothing could not protect us from the cold, it was not because there were not enough pieces but because the pieces were badly worn.

He describes the Dora camp as follows:

The installation of the camp at Dora began in November 1943 (Page 40)

Actually, the first convoy arrived there on August 28, 1943, exactly. Concerning our reception at Dora, he writes:

There, as at Buchenwald, the S.S. were waiting for us at the unloading of the cars. A road furrowed with ruts full of water led to the camp. We ran along it at race speed. The Nazis with big boots on, chased us and *let their dogs loose on us...* This new style of "corrida" was punctuated with many gun shots and inhuman yells... (Pages 43-44, emphasis added.)

I have no recollection that dogs were set on us or that any guns were fired. On the contrary, I remember very well that the *Kapos* and *Lagerschutz* (camp police composed of prisoners) who came to take charge of us were much more aggressive and brutal than the S.S. who had convoyed us.

Before going on to the serious errors, I would like still to point out two more which are not so serious but which expose the lack of accuracy of Birin's testimony, all the more so when one recalls that the author was, through his duties in the camp, in control of job placement which eliminates any excuse:

I will only mention that good old doctor Mathon, nicknamed Papa Girard ... (Page 81)

For ten months I always carried on my person the Holy Reservation. Priests, constantly risking death, kept me always replenished. I should mention here Abbé Bourgeois, the R.P. Renard, Trappist, and that dear Abbé Amyot d'Inville. (Page 87)

For one thing, there was at Dora a doctor Mathon and a doctor Girard. The latter was very old and it was he who we had nicknamed "good Papa Girard." For another, Abbé Bourgeois died in the second month after he came to Dora, between the 10th and the 30th of April, 1944 before the departure of a transport of the sick, among whom he was supposed to have been included. He, therefore, could not have kept Frère Birin supplied for ten months. One might also add that if the priests were maltreated for the same reasons as the other deportees, and even more because of their religious calling, they still were not risking death by keeping in their possession the Holy Reservation.

Now to turn to the serious errors that Frère Birin includes in his account. He writes that:

The wives of the S.S. also picked out their victims, and with even more cynicism than their husbands. What they wanted were fine human skins, artistically tattooed to humor them, an assembly was ordered on the parade grounds, Adam naked was the rule. Then, these women went up and down the ranks, as if at a style show, and made their choices. (Pages 73-74)

It is not correct to say that these things took place at Dora. There was one case of a lamp shade made of tattooed human skin at Buchenwald. It figures in the case of Ilse Koch, who was called "the Bitch of Buchenwald." And, even at Buchenwald, Frère Birin could not have been present at the selection of the victims, as is claimed in his statement that is already cited from page 38, since these incriminating activities took place before we arrived at Buchenwald, if, in fact, they ever did take place at all. He gives to this selection of victims the feeling that it was something that happened regularly and as a matter of course and that his description is quite precise. If the

person who had placed the event at Buchenwald, in the first place, from having seen evidence of the crime (the lamp shades in question), did so in the same fashion, how can one avoid thinking that the accusation against Ilse Koch rests on very fragile grounds? (1)

To conclude the matter, I shall point out that from February through March 1944, a camp rumor at Buchenwald maintained that two Kapos, one from the *Steinbruch* (quarry) and the other from the *Gartnererei* (garden) were responsible for that crime, which earlier had been perpetrated by them with the complicity of almost all of their colleagues. The two comrades had, it was said, made a business of the killing of tattooed prisoners, whose skins they sold for various favors to Ilse Koch and others, through the intermediary of the *Kapo* of the crematorium service and of some S.S. personnel who looked the other way. But did the wife of the commandant of the camp, and the other wives of officers walk around the camp looking for fine tattoo specimens, whose owners they themselves designated to be killed for their skins? Did they organize roll-calls in the nude to facilitate this search? These allegations I can neither confirm nor deny. All that I can say is that, contrary to what Frère Birin attests, these things never took place at Dora, nor at Buchenwald, during our common internment there.

Where there was a sure case of sabotage, the hanging was carried out in a more cruel fashion. Those about to be executed were lifted up from the ground very slowly by an electric winch. Not getting the fatal jerk that kills the victim and often breaks his neck, the poor men went through all the stages of agony ...

Other times a butcher's hook was placed under the jaw of the condemned man who was thus hung in that barbarous manner. (Page 76)

It is true that at the end of the war -- i.e., between the end of 1944 and the end of the spring of 1945 -- acts of sabotage became so numerous that groups of guilty men were hanged at a time. The S. S. took to holding executions in the Tunnel itself with the use of a pulley worked by a winch, and not just on the parade grounds with gallows that looked like the goal posts on the ends of football fields. On March 8, 1945, nineteen condemned men were hanged in this way, and on Palm Sunday fifty-seven were executed. Palm Sunday, incidentally, was eight days before the Liberation, when we could even hear the Allied cannon very near and when the outcome of the war could not have been in any doubt in the minds of the S. S.! But, the story of the butcher's hook, which was told about Buchenwald, where the instrument was found in the crematory oven, was unlikely to have been true of Dora. In any case, I never heard anything about it in the camp itself and it did not fit in with the way things were done at Dora.

On the instigation of the notorious *Oberscharführer* Sanders, S. S., with whom I had something to do, other methods of execution were used for the saboteurs.

The unfortunates were made to dig narrow ditches, in which their comrades were forced to bury them up to the neck. They were left for a certain length of time. After that an S. S. with a long handled axe cut off their heads.

But the sadism of some of the S. S. led them to discover an even more cruel death. They ordered other prisoners to pour barrow loads of sand over their poor heads. I am still haunted by the looks, etc ... (Page 77)

This, too, was never done at Dora. But the story was told to me in almost the same words, in that camp, by prisoners who had been transferred there from other camps and who all claimed to have been present at the scene: Mauthausen, Birkenau, Flossenburg, Neuengamme, etc... Back in France I came across references to it by various writers; but none concerned Buchenwald or Dora because it was not desirable to place the story, in a written testimony, at a camp where it did not take place. French public opinion, catching an author in a deliberate error, would have become suspicious about all the accounts concerning all of the camps, and German public opinion also would have made an issue of this lie.

Concerning the fate of the deportees, Frère Birin reports as follows:

As *Geheimnisträger* (those who knew the secret of the VI and V2) we knew we were condemned to death and destined to be massacred as soon as the Allies approached (Page 97)

Here it is not a question of a fact but of speculation. Such speculation was engaged in by all the writers of memoirs about the camps up to and including Leon Blum in *Le Dernier Mois*. Blum found some semblance of justification for his speculation in the drownings in the Baltic of some deportees who a short time before Liberation were loaded onto boats which were set adrift and which were allegedly sunk from the shore by gunfire. In addition, he pointed to the statement of an S. S. doctor at Dora who confirmed the existence of secret orders to that effect, and who, in so doing, saved his own life.

In any case, the *Geheimnisträger* at Dora were not massacred; nor was anyone in the evacuation convoy in which Leon Blum was included. For a long time it was maintained that the absence of massacres, which was the case in all the camps, resulted solely because, in the turmoil of the German collapse, the S.S. had neither the time nor the means to carry out their sinister execution plans. Then one day, January 6, 1951, light was thrown suddenly on the worth of that assumption. On that day, in *Le Figaro littéraire*, Mr. Jacques Sabille, of the *Center of Jewish Documentation* at Paris wrote under the title "*Un Juif négocie avec Himmler*" that:

It was thanks to pressure from Gunther, put on Himmler through the intermediary of Kersten (his personal physician), that the fratricidal order to sack the camps at the approach of the Allies --without sparing the guards -- remained a dead letter.

This means that this order, supposedly received by everyone, and brandished with such forceful indignation against the accused at Nuremberg, although not one of the prosecutors could produce a copy of it, was never given by anyone who had the authority to issue it. In 1960, in the *Les Mains du Miracle*, a study by Dr. Kersten, Joseph Kessel confirmed this account unreservedly.

For having testified that the order actually did exist, Dr. Piazza, the S.S. physician at Dora, saved his life, and a number of good marks were awarded him, among them the following statement, made on the 25th day of June, 1954, at the Struthof Trial, by Dr. Bogaerts, Major-Doctor at Etterbeek (Belgium):

I had managed to get myself detailed to the infirmary of the camp, and there I was under S.S. Doctor Piazza's orders, the only man at Struthof with any humane feelings.

Now at Dora, where this Dr. Piazza assumed the position of head doctor of the camp, opinion was unanimous in putting the responsibility on him for all that was inhuman in the diagnosis and treatment of illness in the camp. The reports from the *Revier* (infirmary) were crammed with his misdeeds, which, it was said, his assistant Dr. Kuntz was only able to mitigate with great difficulty. Those who knew him at Struthof spoke of him in horrifying terms. I personally had contact with him and agree with all those in the same position: he was a brute among brutes. Back in France, I was surprised to see so many certificates of good behavior given--by privileged prisoners, true--to a man whom everyone at the camp, even the better disposed, wanted to see hanged. I could only understand it after I had learned that he had been the first, and for a long time the only one, to attest to the authenticity of the order to destroy all of the camps on the approach of the Allies, and to murder all of their occupants, guards included. It was his reward for false testimony; the worth of which at the time could not be known, but which was indispensable for the fabrication of a theory itself indispensable to a policy!

As for the drownings in the Baltic, it has long been a question as to whether they were an isolated instance, due to the excessive zeal of underlings, or whether they were part of a general plan drawn up in various departments on the initiative of Himmler, head of the German Police, and later Minister of the Interior. In reality this is what took place: On the 3rd of May, 1945, in the roads at Neustadt near Lubeck, three ships that were loaded with deportees, who, by an agreement between Himmler and Count Folke Bernadotte, were to be transported to Sweden and from there repatriated to their various countries, were waiting for the order to sail; they were the *Cap Arcona*, the *Deutschland*, and the *Thielbeck*. On that same day, the three ships were attacked by British aircraft, which persisted for hours in the attack, even though the people on the ships hoisted up, from the moment of the first bomb, white flags, and spread out on the decks all the linen, towels, sheets, etc. that they had. But, nothing worked, and the attack was not ended until the pilots decided that no one was left alive on board.

There were 7,000 dead, buried in a cemetery especially made for them. Most of the victims were of foreign nationalities and came from thirty different countries. However, prior to the burial, the mass of bodies that had been taken out of the smoldering ships was piled up on the shore. Photographs and films made of the corpses -- piled like so much cordwood -- were circulated all over the world, and the commentaries of many journalists made them appear as a new atrocity to add to Germany's charge. This was all the easier since the shore batteries of the German D.C.A. had opened fire on the British warplanes, and that fact provided a perfect occasion for spreading the word that the Germans had fired on the three ships, under orders.

The mystery has been cleared up for almost ten years now. It is known that the three ships were destroyed by an attack of British warplanes. This fact is admitted by historians all over the world, even those of the *World Center of Jewish Documentation* and the *Institut für Zeitgeschichte* at Munich. But in *La Tragédie de la Déportation* (1962) Madame Olga Wormser and Mr. Henri Michel still maintain that the drownings in the Baltic were the work of German artillery which had fired on the three ships from the shore. And, no one contests their error -- not even the *Center of Jewish Documentation* or the *Institut für Zeitgeschichte* of Munich, which not only let it stand but which continue to give praise to that "remarkable work."

II. Abbé Jean-Paul Renard

Deported with registration number 39,727, Abbé Jean-Paul Renard preceded Frère Birin and myself by several weeks to Buchenwald; it was Dora where we met him again. He published a collection of poems inspired by a sometimes moving mysticism with the title *Chaines et Lumières*. These poems consist of a series of spiritual reactions rather than any attempt at objective testimony. One of them, nevertheless, enumerates some facts: *J'ai vu, j'ai vu, et j'ai vécu...* Frère Birin published it in an appendix to his own work, which has been discussed in the first section of this chapter. One of the poems reads:

"I saw going into the showers thousands and thousands of persons over whom poured out, instead of liquid, asphyxiating gases. I saw those who were unfit for work injected in the heart."

Actually, Abbé Jean-Paul Renard saw nothing of the kind because gas chambers did not exist either at Buchenwald or at Dora. As for the injections, it was not done at Buchenwald at the time he went through there. When I pointed that fact out to him at the beginning of 1947, he answered, "Right, but that's only a figure of speech... and since those things existed somewhere, it is of no importance."

I found his reasoning delightful. At the moment I did not dare to retort that the Battle of Fontenoy was also an historical reality, but that was no reason for saying, even as a figure of speech, that he had been present. Nor did I say that, if twenty eight thousand survivors of the Nazi camps had claimed that they had been present at all of the horrors set forth by all of the testimonies, the camps would assume, in the eyes of history, quite a different image than if each survivor had confined himself to telling only what he had actually seen. Nor did I mention that it was in our interest that not one of us should be guilty of lying or exaggeration.

When, in July 1947, *J'ai vu, j'ai vu et j'ai vécu* appeared in *Chaines et Lumières*, I had the satisfaction of noting that, although the author had allowed his testimony on the injections to remain in its entirety, he had nevertheless honestly attributed his statement on them as well as on the gas chambers to another prisoner, who, in turn, had laid the responsibility on still another deportee.

III. Abbé Robert Ploton

Abbé Robert Ploton was curé at the *Nativité* at St. Etienne and presently is curé at Firminy. He was deported to Buchenwald with the number 44,015, in January, 1944, in the same convoy with me. We ended up together in Block 48, which we left, also together, for Dora. His account of his deportation, entitled *Montluc à Dora*, was published by Dumas in March, 1946 at St. Etienne.

Montluc à Dora is an unpretentious testimony of 90 pages. Abbé Ploton states the facts simply, as he saw them, without going into much detail and often without checking himself. Manifestly he is quite sincere, and if he sins, it is out of a natural predisposition for the superficial heightened by the eagerness with which he recounts his memories.

For example, when the German collapse came, he was sent to Bergen-Belsen. But, he writes "Belsen-Bergen" throughout the chapter in which he tells about this, so that one cannot think that it was a mere typographical error. And he misses other facts: In Block 48, at Buchenwald, he heard someone say, "We are under the orders of a German prisoner, Communist ex-deputy of the *Reichstag*," (Page 26), and he accepted that statement as being fact. Actually, the particular Block Chief in question, Erich, was only the son of a Communist deputy.

As concerns the camp food, it is doubtless in the same manner that he writes:

On principle, the daily menu consisted of a liter of soup, 400 grams of a very heavy bread, 20 grams of margarine extracted from coal, and a dessert which varied: sometimes a spoon of jam, sometimes white cheese, or again some ersatz sausage. (Page 63-64)

So many people have said that the margarine was made from coal, and without being questioned, that the exact origin of that product is no longer brought up. After all, Louis Martin-Chauffier did even better in writing that:

It seems that nothing pleases them [the S.S.] unless it is artificial; and the margarine that they stingily distributed to us derived all its flavor from having been a product made from coal. [The cardboard box was labeled "Guaranteed to contain no fat."] (*L'Homme et la bete*, Page 95)

When Abbé Ploton undertakes to speak of the categories of prisoners he finds eight classifications, without realizing that there were in reality thirty and when he talks about the camp regime, he writes:

One of the most effective and ignoble ways to moral degradation, *inspired by the instructions in "Mein Kampf"* is to charge a few prisoners, chosen almost exclusively from the Germans, with the policing of the camp. (Page 28, emphasis added.)

He does not know that this ignoble procedure is used, precisely because it is effective, in all the prisons of the world, and that that was the case long before Hitler wrote *Mein Kampf* (2). Shall we recall that *Dante n 'avait rien vu*, by Albert Londres, establishes France in the application of this system in her prisons and jails?

On the duration of the roll-calls, which plagued all of the prisoners, here is the explanation that he gives:

We wait for the count to be verified, a laborious job *the length of which depends on the humor of the S.S. Rapport-Fuhrer*. (Page 59, emphasis added.)

The length of the roll-calls, if it depended on the humor of the *Rapport-Fuhrer*, also depended upon the competence of those persons who were in charge of establishing every day the number of the men present. Among them there were S.S. personnel who generally knew how to count, but there were also illiterate, or almost so, prisoners who had become clerks in the *Arbeitsstatistik* only as a favor. It must not be forgotten that the employment of each prisoner in a concentration camp was determined by his ability to get around and not by his ability to do the job. At Dora, as everywhere else, it happened that masons became accountants, accountants became masons or carpenters, wheelwrights became doctors or surgeons, and it could even happen that a doctor or a surgeon became a fitter, an electrician or an earth-works laborer.

Concerning the injections, Abbé Ploton sides with the general view:

Meanwhile the infirmary had to be expanded and an increasing number of its barracks were built on the hillside. Those with incurable tuberculosis ended their poor existence there as a result of an euthanasia injection.

This practice, as I have explained in earlier pages, is not true.

With the exception of these remarks, this witness is not tainted by a mania for exaggeration. He is simply crushed by an experience which was too much for him. And the inaccuracies of which he is guilty are only minor when compared with those of Frère Birin; they also carry much less influence. But, a concern for objectivity, nevertheless, requires that they be noted.

FOOTNOTES

(1). So fragile was the case against Ilse Koch that the Augsburg Court of Assizes, dealing with the case, refused to hold her for trial due to the lack of evidence.

(2). See Appendix A to this volume: *La discipline à la Maison centrale de Riom*, in 1939, by Pierre Bernard, who was interned there, and *Dans les prisons de la "Liberation"* a testimony given by A. Paraz.

Chapter Nine

Louis Martin-Chauffier

He falls between the lesser witnesses, whom he surpasses due to his effort to explain in a learned way the experiences which he lived through, and the great tenors like David Rousset, whose power of analysis he lacks, or like Eugen Kogon, whose exactness and attention to detail he lacks. Given that, and taking into account the place that he occupies in post-war literature and journalism, he cannot be classified with either the first or with the second.

Martin-Chauffier is a writer by profession. He belongs to that class of writers called "committed." He is committed, but he frees himself often enough -- in order to recommit himself, since commitment is second nature to him. He has been known as a fellow-traveler, and he is now an anti-Communist. Probably, moreover, for the same reasons and under the same circumstances -- i.e., it is the thing to do. He could not fail to give his testimony on the concentration camps for a couple of reasons: First, because his profession is writing. Second, because he had to get straight for himself what had happened to him. The others profited by him. Doubtless, he did not realize that he was saying just what everybody else said, although he expressed it differently. The title of his testimony is *L'Homme et la Bête* (1948, Gallimard). As far as originality is concerned, he saw the cardboard boxes, which contained the margarine - - made of coal, of course -- which were given to us with the label "Guaranteed to contain no fat." Other than that, his testimony is a long chain of reasoning based on facts which the author has isolated from all moral or other reflections.

I. The Line of Argument

Before he was deported to Neuengamme, Louis Martin-Chauffier was for a while at Compiègne-Royallieu. He knew Captain Douce there, who was then camp elder. Here is his opinion of him:

Captain Douce, "doyen" of the camp and zealous servant of those who had put him in that position, perched on a table, doing his figures out loud, chain-smoking the cigarettes which had been refused to us, against regulations. (p. 51).

At Neuengamme, he knew Andre who was one of the important inmates in the camp, an official with authority, chosen from the prisoners by the S.S. This is the portrait he gives of him:

Narrowly watched by the S.S. a most suspicious sort, he was forced, in order to keep the role he had chosen and gotten with difficulty, to speak roughly to

the prisoners, to make a show of being without feeling, unbending and brutal in his language. He knew that the least sign of weakness would inexorably bring denunciation down on him, and his immediate dismissal. Nearly everyone was taken in by his manner, believed him to be working with the SS, their creature, our enemy. Since he was responsible for the sorting out and allocation of posts, he was blamed for all those he sent to the *Kommandos*, with apparent indifference, deaf to prayers, pleas, recriminations... When a thousand deportees were to go to the *Kommandos*, and only about 990 were piling into the cattle cars, no one realized how many ruses Andre had used, all the risks he had run, to preserve ten men from probable death... He knew that he was universally detested or suspect. He had chosen it that way, preferring the service he could render to esteem...

As I saw Andre, he accepted in the same spirit the menacing cordiality of the SS, the corresponding servility of the *Kapos* and the Block chiefs, the hostility of the mass. I think that he had risen above humiliation, substituted a glacial purity for his own inner courage, a stranger even to himself. He had renounced his being, in favor of a duty which in his eyes was deserving of this submission. (Pages 167-168-169.)

Thus of the two men fulfilling the same function, one gets the laconic severity and contempt of the author, while the other enjoys not only his approving indulgence, but even his admiration. When one examines this inconsistency further, one learns, during the course of reading the work, that Andre rendered considerable service to Martin-Chauffier in circumstances when his life was in danger. I did not know Captain Douce at Compiègne, but it is very likely that, compared with Andre, his only mistake was in not knowing how to choose the people for whom he did favors -- since he, too, certainly had his favorites -- and in having too limited a familiarity with literature to know that there was in his realm a certain number of Martin-Chauffiers, and even Martin-Chauffier himself.

And it is not beside the point to add that this kind of reasoning leads to:

I have always admired, with some fear and some repulsion THOSE who, in order to serve their country or a cause they consider just, are willing to face all the consequences of duplicity: the contemptuous defiance of the enemy employing them, and his confidence when HE deceives THEM; and the disgust of his comrades in battle who see in HIM a traitor; and the abject comraderie of the real traitors or those who have simply sold themselves, who seeing HIM doing the same thing, consider HIM as ONE of them. It requires a self-renunciation that is beyond me, a guile which confounds me and goes against my grain. (1) (Page 168)

One wonders whether Pétain's attorneys might not make use of this kind of argument, whose pungency comes from having issued from the pen of one of crypto-Communism's finest ornaments. If Petainism becomes fashionable again, Martin-Chauffier, in any case, will have reason to be proud of it, and perhaps to profit from it...

II. Another Line of Argument

In the camp the author was talking with a doctor who said to him:

There are at present in the camp three times as many sick people as I can take care of. The war will be over in five or six months, at the latest. It is up to me to see to it that the greatest possible number hold out. I have decided. You and others, you will get better slowly. If I send you back to the camp in this state and at this season (we were at the end of December) you will be dead in three weeks. I am going to keep you here. And -- listen carefully -- I am going to bring in those who are not so seriously afflicted, those that a stay in the *Revier* can save. Those who are lost, I am going to reject. (2) I cannot afford the luxury of letting them in just to give them a peaceful death. What I can assure is the care of the living. The others will die eight days sooner: in any case, they would die too soon. It can't be helped, I am not here to be sentimental, but to be effective. That's my job. All my colleagues are in agreement, that's the right thing to do ... Everytime that I refuse to let in a dying man, and he looks at me with stupor, fear, with reproach, I would like to explain to him that I am exchanging his lost life for a life that can be saved. He would not understand, etc... (Page 160)

As far as admittance into the infirmary is concerned, I had the experience that one could get into the *Revier* and be cared for (in a loose manner of speaking) for reasons among which sickness or infirmity were sometimes only secondary; know-how, pull, politics and bribery were the common reasons for getting a hospital bed. I attributed this fact to the general conditions of concentration camp life. Further, if some prisoner doctors behaved the way Martin-Chauffier says this one did, that conduct should be recorded as both a philosophical argument and as a causal element, side by side with the "sadism" of the SS, in explaining the large number of deaths. For it takes a great deal of knowledge, confidence, and also presumption, for a doctor to determine in a few minutes who can be saved and who cannot. And, I am very much afraid that if such were the case generally among doctors, then once having taken this first step toward a new code of professional conduct, they might progressively arrive at another by asking themselves no longer who *could* be saved but who *ought* to be saved and who *ought* not and by resolving this problem of conscience on grounds that have nothing to do with therapeutics.

III. The Regime of the Camps

The treatment inflicted on us by the S.S. was the execution of a plan worked out in high places. It could have refinements, embellishments, flourishes, due to the initiative, the imagination, the tastes of the head of the camp; sadism has nuances. The overall plan was fixed. Before killing us or making us die, we had to be debased. (Page 85)

During the occupation, there existed in France an Association of the Families of Deportees and Political Internees. If a family sent an inquiry to the Association for information about what had become of its deportee, it received, in the return mail, a report coming from those German "high places."

Here is this report. (3)

Weimar camp. -The camp is situated 9 k m. from Weimar and is connected to it with a railroad. It lies at an altitude of 800 m. It consists of three enclosures of concentrically strung barbed wire. In the first enclosure, the prisoners barracks, between the first and the second, the factories and the workshops where T.S.F. accessories are manufactured, pieces of machinery, etc... Between the second and the third lies an area not yet built upon, which has just been cleared of trees, and where they are laying out camp streets and a small railroad.

The first enclosure of barbed wire is electrified and is marked out with a great many watch towers, on top of which there are three armed men. No sentinels in the second and third enclosures, but within the area of the factories there is an SS caserne; during the night they patrol with dogs, likewise in the third enclosure.

The camp spreads over 8 k m. and contains about 30,000 internees. At the beginning of the Nazi regime, its enemies were interned there. The population is partly French, partly foreign, anti-Nazi Germans, but who remain Germans, and who make up most of the Block chiefs. There are also Russians, among them officers of the Red Army, Hungarians, Poles, Belgians, Dutch, etc. ...

The camp regulations are as follows:

4:30 -- Rise, wash, under surveillance, stripped to the waist; washing the body is obligatory.

5:30 -- a half liter of soup or coffee, with 450 gr. of bread (at times they have less bread, but they have an abundant ration of potatoes of good quality), 30 gr. margarine, a slice of sausage or a piece of cheese.

12:00 -- noon - coffee.

18:30 -- a liter of good thick soup.

In the morning at six, leave for work. Assembly is by job, factory, quarry, woodcutters, etc... In each detachment the men line up in rows of five, holding each other by the arm so that the ranks are well aligned and separated. Then they leave, with music at the head (70 or 80 musicians from among the prisoners, in uniform: red pants, blue jackets with black trimming.)

Sanitation in the camp is very good. At the head of this is Professor Richet, deportee. Medical checkup every day. There are numerous doctors, an infirmary and a hospital, just as for a regiment. The internees wear the

costume of German convicts made of artificial cloth, relatively warm. Their underclothing has been disinfected on arrival. There is one blanket for two men.

There is no chapel in the camp. There are, however, a number of priests among the internees, but they generally have concealed their calling. These priests gather together the faithful for talks, recitation of the rosary, etc. ... Free time -- Complete liberty in the camp on Sunday afternoon. This afternoon is enlivened by a theatrical group organized by the prisoners. Cinema, once or twice per week (German films), radio in each barrack (German news). Fine concerts are given by the orchestra made up of internees.

All the prisoners agree that they are better off at Weimar than they were at Fresnes or in the other French prisons.

We call attention to the families of the deportees that the Allied bombardment of the factories at Weimar toward the end of August did not find a single victim among the deportees of the camp.

Jean Puissant, who quoted the above, followed it with this appraisal: "a monument of deceit and lies."

Self-evidently, it is written in a benevolent style. It does not say that in the workshops of Buchenwald the pieces of machinery being made were weapons. It does not speak of the hangings for sabotage, the numerous roll-calls, the conditions of work, or the physical punishments. It does not point out that the Sunday afternoon liberty was subject to limitations which depended upon what went on in the place; nor does it say that if the priests gathered together their faithful for talks and prayers, that such gatherings were clandestine and, were held at the risk that they might be taken for a meeting of conspirators. It even lies when it says that the deportees thought they were better off than in French prisons, that the August 1944 bombardment had no victims among the internees, and that most of the trains leaving Compiègne or Fresnes at that date were headed for Weimar.

But, such as it is this text is closer to the truth than the testimony of Frère Birin, particularly with regard to the food. And, it still is a resume of the regulations of the camps as they were established by the higher levels of the Nazi government. That these regulations were not applied often at the local level is certain. History will tell why. Probably, it will consider the war as the major cause as well as the principle of camp administration by the prisoners themselves. The deterioration which, in a hierarchical administration, all orders undergo as they are handed down from the top to the bottom will be listed also. This deterioration can be seen, for example, in a regiment where the orders of the colonel are delivered by the lieutenant to the sergeant who has the responsibility for their execution. Everyone knows that in a caserne it is the sergeant who is dangerous, not the colonel.

For my part, I am convinced that, within the constraints imposed by the condition of total war, there was nothing to prevent the prisoners who administered over us, who commanded us, who supervised us, and who cadred us, from making life in a

concentration camp something resembling closely the picture that the Germans presented to the families of prisoners.

IV. Maltreatment

I saw my unfortunate comrades, guilty only of not having strong enough arms, die under blows lavished on them by German political prisoners promoted to overseer, who had become the accomplices of their former enemies. (Page 92)

Those brutes, while striking, did not at first intend to kill; nevertheless they did kill in an access of joyous fury, eyes bloodshot, face scarlet and foam on their lips, because they could not stop themselves, they had to go to the very end of their pleasure.

Here we have a deed which, for change, is imputed to the prisoners without any qualifications. One never knows: it is possible that there are people who kill "in an access of joyous fury" and whose only purpose is "to go to the very end of their pleasure." In the normal world, there are abnormal people; likewise, there can also be some in a world where everything is abnormal, such as a concentration camp. But, I am rather led to think that if a *Kapo*, a Block Chief, or a camp elder let himself go to that extent, it was for motives arising from more likely reasons: the need for revenge; the desire to please the masters who had given him his choice post; the desire to hold onto it at any price, etc. I believe that even if they had resorted to the brutality which is described above, they usually stopped short of killing a man, since his death might have gotten them in trouble with the SS, at least at Buchenwald and Dora.

In spite of this explanation, Martin-Chauffier must be forgiven for having cited two more actions whose criminal nature can in no way be considered the result of the execution of a plan "worked out in high places":

Each week the *Kapo* of the *Revier* made his rounds (he was completely ignorant about it), examined the temperature charts whose margins were covered with remarks about a disturbing diagnosis, looked at the sick: if he didn't like their looks, he stated that they were to leave, whatever condition they were in. The doctor tried to forestall or influence his decision, which was difficult to foresee, since the *Kapo* whose impressions took the place of knowledge was a lunatic, besides. (Page 185). The frigid draft, the obligatory washing stripped to the waist, were hygienic provisions. Each killing process was thus cloaked in the guise of sanitation. This proved to be most efficacious. All those who suffered from some chest ailment were carried out in a few days. (Page 192).

Nothing obliged the *Kapo*, the *Stubendienst*, or the *Pfleger* of the *Revier*, to let a draft of ice cold air through, to make the unfortunate patients in their care wash bare-chested in cold water, or to render medical decisions without the concurrence of the treating physicians. Nevertheless, they did do it, with the aim of pleasing the SS, who most of the time knew nothing about it, and of holding on to the positions which saved their lives. One would like to have seen Martin-Chauffier direct his accusations

against them with as much vigor as he has done against the SS, or -- at least -- divide the responsibility between them.

V. A Qualified Witness?

The following is an account of Martin-Chauffier which was written by Dominique Canavaggio (former editor-in-chief of *Temps de Paris* and son-in-law of Pastor Boegner):

Louis Martin-Chauffier -- who later was to be arrested by the *Gestapo* and sent to Auschwitz -- was a contributor to *Sept jours*, a weekly newspaper of Jean Prouvost. One morning when I was in Lyon he visited me. His face was distorted with anxiety. He said, "My daughter has tuberculosis; her condition is very serious. I have tried to have her treated in France. It is impossible: nowhere here does one find combined the necessary altitude, comfortable accommodations and board: only a sojourn in Switzerland could save her. Do you think that she could obtain a travel pass from Laval?"

I promised him even to attempt the impossible, and upon my return I went immediately to see the head of the government in Vichy. Impossible was truly the right word, for since November 1942 the Germans tightly controlled all travel in and out of France at the Swiss frontier; they allowed, practically, no one to cross the border except some official persons. Besides, the name of Martin-Chauffier was already at that time suspected by Laval and was not likely, for that reason, to make things easier. Laval listened to my request without interrupting me, then when I had finished, he said, "Martin-Chauffier?... He is, I suppose, the fellow who at the time of Munich wrote an article in which he demanded that I should be sent to the gallows?"

"Yes," Mr. President, "that is he."

There was a moment of silence. I looked at him firmly. Finally he spoke, "Tell him that his daughter will go to Switzerland... Arrange the formalities with Bousquet." "Thank you, Mr. President; I was sure that you would do it. And I am not sure that Martin-Chauffier will be grateful ..."

He motioned me back and said, "I want no thanks. I do it from a sense of duty to mankind."

As we have seen, Martin-Chauffier, was especially suited to become one of the leaders of the Resistance Movement in France. He furthermore "honored" with his (episodic) collaboration *Le Figaro*, *Paris-Press*, and *Paris Match*. The biographical reference work, *Pharos*, writes of him that before the war he made his political opinions clearly recognizable, and his sympathy for Communism during the Civil War in Spain confirmed them. In 1939 he traveled in the U.S.S.R. The year 1945 found him, naturally, again on the side of the Communists in the famous National Committee of Authors and among the most furious of persecutors.

Without doubt, he had to try to be forgiven for what had happened between these two dates. For today, Martin-Chauffier, like Eugen Kogon and David Rousset, holds himself aloof (or acts as if he held himself aloof) from the Communists, whose game he has played and continues to play. But, for how long? I pose this question for a very good reason.

On March 18, 1953, when I had just been sentenced by the Court of Appeals at Lyon, Jean Paulhan, since elected to the membership of the French Academy, wanted to express his sympathy; a 100,000 franc fine, together with an assessment of damages, in the sum of 800,000 francs, and a sentence of eight days in jail (which was suspended) had seemed alarming to him, and being less familiar than I was with such things, he did not know, as I did, that this judgment would surely be reversed by the Supreme Court. This is what he wrote:

I have followed (from a distance) your trial and the iniquitous judgment that ended it. Your book was splendid, and I wish I had written it. Perhaps it is due to it, and to the obvious absurdity of the quarrels they have tried to pick with you, that I am indebted for not having been prosecuted. (4) As for Martin-Chauffier, who indeed understands grammar but poorly, he was busy in 43 getting for the Germans (specifically from Maison Beraud, metallurgy, 315 rue Grimaldi, Lyon, for Captain Schwenn) ferrous and non-ferrous ores. That is what gives him the right to speak. Yours, with all sympathy.

The witness for the prosecution at my trial, Martin-Chauffier had not dared confront me at the bar, and that is easy to understand, but he all the same sent the President of the Court a telegram in which he demanded "a merciless condemnation."

Moral: Ah! These witnesses -- excuse me: Ah! These Resistants! That is all.

FOOTNOTES

(1) This quotation has not been faked, in spite of the error in syntax that might make one think so, which is emphasized by the words in capital letters. In *Le Droit de vivre* of December 15, 1950, Martin-Chauffier claimed, in these words, that the text was correctly written: "It is useless to add that there is no error of syntax -- another lie -- but that a comma, inserted by M. Rassinier in place of the colon that I had put there, could deceive those not very sure of their grammar." For Martin-Chauffier is convinced that one nail drives out another. And he is too sure of his grammar" for one to be able easily to count on him for the relations that exist between the verb and its subject or the pronoun and its antecedent. The moral: a gentleman who comes out of the *Ecole des Chartes* is evidently not obliged to know what is expected of a child of ten to get into the 6th grade. Not wanting to haggle over a penny we re-inserted the colon claimed by Mr. Martin-Chauffier which an unfortunate slip had indeed replaced with a semi-colon in the first edition: the reader who can see that this changes anything is kindly requested to write to us.

(2) Emphasized in the text.

(3) As far as I know this has only been cited by Jean Puissant in his book, *La Colline sans oiseaux* (Editions du Rond-Point, 1945). A generally honest and detailed monograph, one of the best testimonies on the camps.

(4) On February 20, 1952, Jean Paulhan had written an "Open Letter to the Directors of the Resistance" (Gallimard-Paris) in which he had questioned the prevailing orthodoxy, and which had produced as much emotion as *Le Mensonge d'Ulysse*.

Chapter Ten

The Psychologists: David Rousset and the Universe of the Concentration Camp

Of all of the witnesses, none has matched David Rousset's ability, power of evocation, and exactness in reconstructing the general atmosphere of the camps, of which he is the acknowledged great spokesman, worldwide. Neither, has any other witness fictionalized his account more or in a better fashion.

I am afraid that history will remember his name; but mostly for his literary quality. At this level of history, properly so called, the wrapping outdoes the contents. He was, moreover, aware of this fact and attempted to forestall objections:

I have reported certain things as they took place at Buchenwald, and not as they are described in documents published subsequently...

...Especially are there contradictions in details, not only in the testimonies, but in the documents. Most of the texts published up to the present are concerned only with aspects quite outside life in the camps, or are apologies in the form of allusions which affirm principles rather than assemble facts. Such documents are valuable, but only if one is intimately acquainted with what is being said; in that case they often provide another hitherto unperceived link. I have made a special effort to bring forth the relations between the groups in their actual complexity and in their dynamics. (*Les Jours de notre mort*, Appendix, page 764.)

This sort of reasoning allows him totally, or nearly so, to ignore the documents, and, in view of the fact that those pertaining to the camps in the East are both very few and very poor, to state that, "Recourse to direct testimony is the only proper way to proceed." He then selects from these direct testimonies those that best illustrate his way of looking at things at the moment. "Given these conditions," he acknowledges, "it was a bold -- perhaps one should say, rash -- venture to want to present a panorama of the whole of the concentration camp world." (*Ibid.*)

One could not put it better than he does himself. But then, why describe the camps using this method in which all is based on categorical assertion?

L'Univers concentrationnaire (Pavois, 1946) had a deserved success. In the midst of the minor witnesses who howled for vengeance and death on the heels of the defeated Germans, it tried to lay the responsibilities on Nazism and, by so doing, marked a new direction.

By way of illustration of the atmosphere at the time, take Frère Birin, who penned the following warning:

The French should know and remember that the same errors will bring back the same horrors. They should be informed of the character and shortcomings of their neighbors across the Rhine, a race of dominators, and that is why No. 43,652 wrote these lines. Frenchmen, be vigilant and never forget. (*16 mois de bagne*, p. 117.)

And, that was the tone in all the French press, too. "*Le boche*" was on everybody's lips, with the snarl that goes with the word when it is pronounced correctly. In this atmosphere of hatred, pacifist France was grateful to David Rousset for having concluded with these words:

The existence of the camps is a warning. German society, both because of the strength of its economic structure, and the ruthlessness of the crisis which crushed it, has experienced a decomposition exceptional in the present situation of the world. But it would be easy to show that the traits most characteristic of S.S. mentality and the social substructures, can be found in many other areas in world society. Less pronounced, however, and certainly not to be compared with the developments we have seen in the Great Reich. But it is only a question of circumstances. One would be guilty of deception if one pretended that it is impossible for other peoples to have the same experience because it is against their nature. Germany has interpreted, with the originality peculiar to her history, the crisis which led her to the universe of concentration camps. But the existence and mechanism of this crisis derive from the economic and social bases of capitalism and imperialism. Under a new guise, analogous results could appear again tomorrow. Consequently there is a very definite battle to be conducted. (Page 187)

With the passage of time, what has happened in Algeria and in Indochina and what is today taking place between Blacks and Whites in the United States and between Jews and Arabs in the Middle East, has demonstrated, more than could be expected, how justified Rousset's theory was. Moreover, what was then still going on in Russia demonstrated it no less, but at that time David Rousset was careful not to make use of that argument. On a more mundane level one could find still more justifications; take this one for example:

When several hundreds of thousands of adult "displaced persons" succeeded in getting out of the camps and in leaving for the two Americas, thousands of children remained behind, together with the old people, in the care of the I.R.O.... in the sinister barracks of Germany, Austria and Italy. But the International Refugee Organization is scheduled definitely to cease its activities in a few months, and one wonders what will be the fate of these orphans twice abandoned. Their situation is tragic right now, because in some camps they have not received more food in all than three to four hundred calories a day, and no one can say if even that inadequate ration can be kept up. The death rate under such conditions is terrible. (*La Bataille*, May 9, 1950.)

The paper said that there were thirteen million living like that, in a Europe that had got rid of Hitler and Mussolini. If an investigation had been made into the treatment

that they were subjected to by their guardians, it would be interesting to see upon whom the responsibility would be placed.

Les Jours de notre mort (1947), which takes up the facts as given in *L'Univers concentrationnaire* and carries them to the limits of speculation, strays far from that profession of faith while *Le Pitre ne rit pas* (1948) ignores it entirely. From which it must be concluded that David Rousset's thinking went through such evolutions, under cover of going into details, that his books ended up on a note much more anti-German than anti-Nazi in the eyes of the public. This evolution was all the more noticeable in that being shaded with certain weaknesses for Communism at the start, it developed, in the end, into an anti-Communism, which one would not want to say could never turn into Russophobia pure and simple, if the cold war should reach such a point as to turn into a shooting war.

The originality, therefore, of *L'Univers concentrationnaire* lay in drawing a distinction between Germany and Nazism in the determination of responsibilities. But, this originality was more than matched by the sensational theory that justified the conduct of the prisoners who were in charge of running the affairs of the camps, on the basis that it was necessary to preserve, for the post-war period, the elite of the revolutionaries at the expense of all of the others. David Rousset embraced this theory by justifying the policy of saving a certain kind of prisoner, that he defined in terms of certain extra-humanitarian imperatives. As evidence of that policy, the malicious could point out that David Rousset was probably saved from death by the German Communist *Kapo*, Emile Kunder, who considered that he belonged to that revolutionary elite, who showed him great friendship for that reason, and who, today, disowns him.

I. The Postulate of the Theory

It is normal, when all the active forces of one class are the stake of the greatest totalitarian battle yet invented, that the enemies be put where they can do no harm, and, if necessary, be exterminated. (Page 107)

This statement is unassailable. His conclusion, set forth without transition, is much less so: "The purpose of the camps is indeed physical destruction." (Ibid.) One cannot but notice that, in the postulate itself, physical destruction is subordinate to necessity, and is envisaged only in cases where the extent of internment is not enough to prevent the individual from doing harm.

After a leap, or an off-hand deduction, of this kind, there was no reason to stop, and he could write:

The order bears the mark of the master. The commanding officer of the camp knows nothing. The *Block-Fuhrer* (S.S. responsible for the livelihood of a Block) knows nothing. The *Lagerältester* (camp elder, prisoner selected by the S.S.) knows nothing. Those who carry out the order know nothing. *But the order prescribes death and the kind of death and how much time it shall take*

to cause death. And in this desert of knowing nothing, that is enough. (Page 100, emphasis added.)

With this assertion he found a way both of placing the responsibility of the camps on those "high-places" of Louis Martin-Chauffier, and of allowing him to conclude in favor of a pre-established plan for the systematizing of terror, justified by a philosophy.

The enemy, in the philosophy of the S.S., is the force of evil, intellectually and physically expressed. The Communist, the socialist, the German liberal, the revolutionaries, the foreign Resistants are the active representations of evil. But the objective existence of certain races: the Jews, the Poles, the Russians, is a static expression of evil. It is not necessary for a Jew, a Pole, or a Russian to act against National Socialism; they are by birth, by predestination unassimilable heretics, dedicated to the apocalyptic fire. *Death therefore has no complete meaning. Only expiation can satisfy and appease the lords. The concentration camps are the astonishing and complex machinery of expiation. Those who are to die go to their deaths with a slowness calculated so that their physical and moral downfall, by degrees, shall finally make them conscious of the fact that they are accursed, the expressions of evil, and not men. And that priest-administrator of justice feels a sort of secret pleasure, a deep-seated sensation of delight, in ruining bodies.* (Pages 108-109, emphasis added.)

From this excerpt it can be seen that, starting from concentration camps as places to put enemies where they can do no harm, one can easily make of them institutions of extermination and one can elaborate to infinity on the purpose of that extermination. From the moment that one reaches that stage, it becomes no more than an intellectual exercise where one can demonstrate his aptitude for mental constructions and his talent for writing. But, the literary effort which produces such a fine description of sadism is perfectly useless, and one need not have lived through the experience to describe it like that; one need only consult Tomas de Torquemada and copy down the arguments of the Spanish Inquisition.

I shall not waste time with a discussion of the first part of the explanation which ties the Russians and the Poles together with the Jews in the minds of the Nazi leaders; it is obvious fantasy.

II. The Labor

By labor is meant a means of punishment. Concentration camp manpower is of secondary interest, a preoccupation foreign to the nature of the concentration camp universe. Psychologically, it was connected by that sadism that forced the prisoners to strengthen the instruments of their bondage.

"It was because of the accidents of history that the camps also became public works enterprises. On the extension of the war to a world scale, calling for the total employment of everybody and everything, the lame, the deaf, the blind,

and the PGs, the S.S., with lashes of the whip, enrolled the blind mob of the concentration camps for the most destructive tasks . . . The work of the concentration inmates did not have as its ultimate object the carrying out of specific tasks, but the keeping of the "protected prisoners" [1] in the strictest most debasing confinement. (Pages 110-112.)

Since it has been decided that the purpose of the camps was to exterminate, it is quite obvious that the work that was performed there is hardly more than an element, negligible in itself, in the theory of the extermination mystique. Eugen Kogon, who will be considered in the following chapter, starting from the same idea but with much less refinement in form, writes regarding this issue in his *L'Enfer organisé*.

...It was decided that the camps should have a secondary purpose, a little more realistic, a little more practical and more immediate; thanks to them, they were going to collect and make use of a manpower composed of slaves, belonging to the S.S., who, for as long as they were permitted to live, should live only to serve their masters ... But, what were called the secondary aims (keeping the population in fear, the use of slave manpower, keeping the camps up as training and experimental stations for the S.S.) these aims little by little rose to the first level, insofar as they were the true reasons for consignment to the camps, *until the day when, the war, unleashed by Hitler*, envisaged and prepared by him and the S.S., in an ever more systematic way, brought about the enormous expansion of the camps. (Pages 27-28, emphasis added.)

By setting these two passages side by side it appears that for the first it was the historic accident of the war, and then only at the moment that it became world wide, which made the use of the prisoners as manpower the important purpose of the camps, while for the second, this result had been achieved *before the war*, and the war only emphasized it.

I choose the second interpretation for the following reason: the division of the camps into these categories -- i.e., *Konzentrationslager* (concentration camp), *Arbeitslager* (work camp), and *Straflager* (punishment camp, where the labor and living conditions were harder) -- was an accomplished fact when the war broke out in 1939. The operation of internment, before and during the war, was accomplished in two stages: the prisoners were concentrated in a central camp that was planned for or already was organized for labor, and which served, in addition, as a sorting station; from there the prisoners were sent on to other camps, according to the demands for manpower. There was a third stage for those who had committed offenses during the process of being interned; assignment as punishment to a camp generally still in construction, which was considered a punitive camp (*Straflager*), but which, from the moment that construction was completed, became in its turn an ordinary camp (*Konzentrationslager*).

I shall add that, in my opinion, the use of prisoner labor had always been anticipated. This is part of the universal code of repression: in almost all countries of the world, the State makes those that it imprisons sweat for their livelihood by laboring for the State; there are a few exceptions -- e.g., fallen government officials in the democratic nations and distinguished deportees in dictatorships. The contrary practice is inconceivable. It would be nonsense for a State to support those who break its laws

and undermine its foundations. It is only the conditions of labor that vary, depending upon whether one is free or interned, and the margin of benefits to be earned.

For Germany, there was an added factor which needs to be noted: the camps had to be built under the imperatives of a total war. During the war, one could only think that the sole purpose of the camps was to kill people off and one was quite inclined to think so even afterwards. The erroneousness of this impression was all the less obvious since, as the war made necessary an even greater number of camps, the construction period never came to an end, and the two circumstances, superimposed in their effects, led to a generalized continuation of the *Straflager* stage, seemingly deliberate.

III. The *Häftlingsführung*

We know that the S.S. delegated to the prisoners the direction and administration of the camps and that this practice of self-administration was called *Häftlingsführung*. There were, for example, *Kapos* (who headed *Kommandos*), *Blockältester* (Block supervisors), *Lagerschutz* (prisoner police), *Lagerältester* (camp supervisors) along with other prisoners who composed a whole concentration camp bureaucracy which in fact wielded all of the authority in the camp. This practice also follows a pattern that is part of the code of regression all over the world. If the prisoners to whom fell all of those administrative posts had the slightest notion of solidarity with the common prison population, they would have worked everywhere to alleviate the hardships for everyone. Unhappily that is never the case. Everywhere, on taking over the post that is placed in his command, the designated prisoner (often called a "trusty") changes his outlook. It is a phenomenon too well known to dwell on and too universal to impute solely to the Germans or the Nazis. David Rousset's error was to believe that it could be any other way in a concentration camp and that, in fact, it had been otherwise -- i.e., that the political prisoners were beings superior to the common mass of prisoners and that the laws they obeyed were nobler than the laws of the individual struggle for life.

This error led him to lay down as a principle that the prisoner bureaucracy of the concentration camps, not being able to save large numbers of men, deserved credit for saving the "best" of the prisoners: "With the close collaboration of a *Kapo* one could make life much easier, even in the Hell." (Page 166.) But he does not tell how one could get the close collaboration of a *Kapo*. Nor that this collaboration, except when the *Kapo* was a political prisoner, ever went beyond the kind of relationship that one would expect to exist between a patrician and his dependent. In any case, he fails to mention that only a tiny number of prisoners could hope to achieve this relationship, regardless of its precise nature.

Obviously, the positions within the *Häftlingsführung* were eagerly sought after, since to hold one improved the relative conditions that one faced in the camp. David Rousset writes that:

The holding of those posts was therefore a prime interest, and the life and death of many men depended on it. (Page 134)

Then trying to link everything together, Rousset asserts that those who held those posts organized, and most of those who organized were Communists: then they worked out regular political plots against the S.S.: then they drew up programs for action after the war:

At Buchenwald the secret central committee of the Communist faction was composed of Germans, Czechs, a Russian and a Frenchman. (Page 166)

From 1944 on they were preoccupied with the conditions that would be created by the end of the war. They were greatly afraid that the S.S. would kill them all before that. And it was not an imaginary fear. (Page 170)

At Buchenwald, besides the Communist organization that without doubt achieved there a degree of *perfection* and efficiency unique in the annals of the camps, meetings took place more or less regularly among the political elements, from the socialists to the extreme right, which ended in setting up a program of joint activity for when they returned to France. (Page 81)

All of this activity is a possibility, but it is factually questionable that such organization ever occurred. Certainly, in all of the camps, the prisoners gathered together in numerous and unobtrusive and informal group alignments for various reasons: to better endure their common fate; to promote their self-interest; to get appointed to the *Häftlingsführung* and, once appointed, to hold that position. But, these prisoner alliances were a far cry from the picture that Rousset paints.

After the liberation, as David Rousset corroborates, the Communists were able to make people believe that the bond of their association was their doctrine, to which their acts conformed. In reality, the bond was the material advantages that were to be gained by those in the association. In the two camps which I knew, the general view was that, political or not, Communist or not, all of the so-called "Committees" were first of all associations of food thieves regardless of whatever form they took. Nothing has been uncovered to change this view. On the contrary everything has confirmed it: the small groups of Communists affronting each other over the various spoils of the system e.g., the composition of the clique which held power; the manner in which the spoils of pillage were to be divided up; the distribution of camp assignments, etc., etc... For example, during the few weeks that I spent at Buchenwald in Block 48, at the suggestion of the *Blockältester*, or with his authorization, a group of prisoners, new arrivals, had decided to bolster the group morale. Little by little they acquired a certain degree of authority. In particular, contact between the *Blockältester* and ourselves in the end could only be made through them. The group regulated life in the Block, organized discussions, assigned the duties, and divided up the food, among other things. It was pitiful to see the toadyism toward the omnipotent *Blockältester* that developed among them. One day, the principal mover in this group was caught in the act of dividing up with another the potatoes that he had stolen from the common ration...

Eugen Kogon relates that the French at Buchenwald, who were about the only ones to receive parcels from the Red Cross, had decided to share them equally with the whole camp:

When our French comrades said they were going to share a large part of them with the entire camp, this act of fellowship was received with gratitude. But the distribution was organized in a scandalous manner for weeks; there was in effect only one parcel for every ten Frenchmen... while their compatriots in charge of the distribution, having at their head the chief of the French communist group in the camp [2], reserved for themselves piles of parcels, or used them for the benefit of their friends of the same stamp. (*L'Enfer organisé*, Page 120.)

David Rousset sees a harmful aspect in this state of things, if not a principal cause of the horror, when he writes:

The bureaucracy does not serve only in the management of the camps; it is, at the top, all involved in the deals of the S.S. Berlin sends cases of cigarettes and tobacco to pay the men. Truckloads of food arrive at the camps. Every week the men are to be paid; they get paid every two weeks or every month; the number of cigarettes is reduced and lists are made of bad workers who get nothing. The men are dying for want of a smoke. What does that matter: The cigarettes go into the black market. Meat? Butter? Sugar? Honey? Jam? A bigger portion of red cabbage, beets, rutabagas, touched up with a little carrot, that will do well enough. It is even pure kindness... Milk. Lots of whitened water, that will do perfectly. And all the rest: meat, butter, sugar, honey, jam, milk, potatoes, on the market for the German civilians who pay and are proper citizens. The people in Berlin will be satisfied to learn that everything arrived all right. It is enough that the records are in order and the bookkeeping verifiable ... Flour? Of course, the bread ration will be reduced. Without even covering it up. The portions will be a little less carefully cut. The records are not concerned with such things. And the S.S. masters will be on excellent terms with the tradesmen of the area. (Pages 145-146-147)

Here, support is given, at least as far as the food is concerned, to the legend that a plan was drawn up "in high places" to starve the prisoners. Berlin supplied everything that was needed to provide the prisoners with adequate rations, in conformity with the reports that were written to the families, but, without the knowledge of the officials, it was not distributed to the mass of prisoners. And, why not? Who does the stealing? The prisoners who were in charge of the distribution. David Rousset tells us that such theft was done under the orders of the S.S. to whom was turned over the proceeds. No, the prisoner trustees stole for themselves first, and took all that they required. Then, they paid some of it to the S.S. to purchase their complicity.

Incidentally, the same phenomenon was brought to light in May 1950 during the trial instituted against the "*Oeuvre des mères et des enfants*" at Versailles, whose ring leader was headmistress Pallu. Preliminary investigation revealed that:

The children were badly clothed, left in a repulsive state of filth, in a room crawling with vermin. The straw mattresses were foul with excrement and urine, crawling sometimes with maggots. There was but one sheet, one blanket. All the toilets were stopped up. The children relieved themselves just where they were. They were covered with impetigo and lice. That was the setting. There 13 children died of hunger. And yet they were supposed to have

received, in addition to their normal rations, supplementary allocations. The children saw nothing of this: the milk was half watered.

"The children were getting too much," said a sister. "The headmistress had a liter and a half of milk delivered to her every day, chocolate, rice, meat -- and of the best quality."

"The headmistress, a little brunette, sent twenty-kilo packages to her family, out of her personal reserves. All those people were well nourished, and did not wonder at that choice food during times when the daily rutabaga was the rule. And the children? Oh! that was so easy, they didn't ask for anything..." (*Le Populaire*, May 16, 1950.)

This account is in a class with the best accounts covering the German concentration camps. The drama took place in France, and neither the public nor even those in the administration of "*L'oeuvre des mères et des enfants*" knew anything about it. The children died there like inmates of a concentration camp, under the same conditions and for the same reasons... and in a democratic country, to boot!

So, to return to the subject at hand, these famous "revolutionary committees" never defended the interests of the common prisoners or prepared political plans for use after the war, the Communists were able to delude the public on these points. Rather, they existed merely to promote the well-being of their members. I shall add that those persons who succeeded in forming them, kept alive a spirit of subservience vis-à-vis the S.S., a kind of collaboration, without which the camps could not have operated.

Regarding the discussions organized in Block 48, and to which reference has been made, David Rousset has this to say:

So I organized a first discussion; a Russian *Stubendienst* twenty-two or twenty-three years old, worker in the Marty Factory at Leningrad, gave us a long exposition of the condition of labor in the U.S.S.R. The discussion which followed lasted for two afternoons. The second talk was given by a Kolkhosian on Soviet agricultural organization. I myself, gave a little later a talk on "The Soviet Union, from Revolution to War"... (Page 77)

I was present at that talk; it was a masterpiece of Bolshephilism, rather unexpected for one familiar with David Rousset's earlier Trotskyite activities. But Erich, our *Blockältester*, was a Communist and was in very good standing with the "cell" which exercised the preponderant influence in the *Häftlingsführung* at the moment. It was artful to get his attention and to predispose him for the day when he would have favors to dispense. "Three months later," continues Rousset, "I would certainly not have begun this endeavor again. The game was played out. But at the time we were all still very ignorant. Erich, our Block chief, grumbled, but didn't oppose the business..." (Page 77) To be sure. Furthermore, three months later, it was *Kapo* Emil Kunder on whom siege had to be laid. The time of the talks was over, and the emphasis was on the Red Cross packages from France. If I have correctly understood *Les Jours de notre mort*, Rousset used these packages to his advantage, and I do not reproach him for it; I myself owe my return to France to them, and I never made any secret of it.

It could be, and perhaps it will be, maintained that it was not important to establish the fact that the *Häftlingsführung* made the common prisoners suffer a treatment that was substantially more horrible than that which had been planned for them by the higher circles of Nazism and that nothing forced the *Häftlingsführung* to do it. If such a contention were made, I would then observe that it has seemed to me to be indispensable to determine exactly the causes of the concentration camp hell in all their aspects, if only to place the contentions of the *Häftlingsführung* apologists in the proper context, and to orient a little more toward the true nature of things the inquiry of the reader in whose mind this problem remains unresolved.

IV. Objectivity

Birkenau, the largest city of death. The selections on arrival; the trappings of civilization set out like caricatures to deceive and subdue. Regular selections in the camp, every Sunday. The inevitable destructions in Block 7 long drawn out. The *Sonderkommando* (special Kommando assigned to the Crematory) totally isolated from the world, condemned to live every second of its eternity with tortured and burned bodies. Terror breaks the nerves so decisively that the death agonies know all the humiliations, all the betrayals. And when, ineluctably, the strong odors of the gas chamber close, everyone rushes forward, crushing each other in a frenzy to keep alive, so that, when they are opened the bodies inextricably tangled fall forward in cascades onto the rails. (Page 51)

In such a fictionalized panorama as *Les Jours de notre mort*, this passage will cause no shock. But, in *L'Univers concentrationnaire*, which has in so many aspects the character of a true story, it would be out of place. David Rousset was not, actually, ever present at this scene of torture of which he gives so exact and so gripping a description.

In 1950, it was still too soon to pronounce a definite judgment on the existence of gas chambers in the camps; documents were wanting and those that existed were incomplete, inexact, and obviously apocryphal or falsified. But, the historian has no right to bring forth gratuitous hypotheses. Therefore, I limited myself to pointing out obvious anomalies. For example, Eugen Kogon, who in his *L'Enfer organisé*, said that "a very small number of camps had their own gas chambers," (Page 154), was careful not to say which ones. Or again, concerning those which allegedly were installed at Auschwitz-Birkenau, Kogon told how the Germans effected the extermination by this method, according to the testimony:

...of a young Jew from Brno, Janda Weiss, who belonged in 1944 with the *Sonderkommando* (crematory and gas chambers) from whom come the following details, confirmed, moreover, by others. (Page 155)

To my knowledge, this Janda Weiss was the only person in the whole of the concentration camp literature who was said to have been present at such exterminations and whose exact address was given. Unfortunately, by an unhappy chance, he was in the Russian zone and only Eugen Kogon has profited by his

statements. Given the historical and moral significance of the use of gas chambers as a method of repression, further steps could possibly have been taken to acquaint the public with his precise testimony, other than through a third party, and at the same time to extend its length to a little more than that of a paragraph that appeared to have been incidentally included in Kogon's comprehensive study.

There was another doubtful element in Eugen Kogon's thesis regarding the gas chambers, and it lay in this:

In 1941, Berlin sent to the camps the first orders for the formation of special transports for gas extermination. The first ones chosen were prisoners in for breaches of the common law, prisoners sentenced for immoral behavior, and certain political figures in bad odor with the S.S.

These transports left for an unknown destination. In the case of Buchenwald one could see being returned the next day, clothing, including the contents of the pockets, dentures, etc... Through an under-officer of the escort it was learned that these transports had arrived at Pirna and at Hohenstein and that the men who made up the transports had been subjected to tests of a new gas and had perished.

During the winter of 1942-1943, all the Jews had been examined with regard to their capacity for work. Instead of the above-mentioned transports, it was then those Jews, who, in groups of 90 men, took the same road, but ended up at Bernburg near Kothén. The doctor-in-chief of the nursing home of the district, a certain Doctor Eberl, was the docile tool of the S.S. In the files of the S.S. this operation bore the reference "14F. 13." It seems to have been carried out simultaneously with the annihilation of all the sick in the nursing homes, which little by little became the general practice in Germany under National-Socialism. (Pages 225-226)

Now, I had already studied the matter enough to know that the extermination orders to which he alludes stem from a program of euthanasia, not of extermination. The two documents that he quoted in support of his contention -- and he was careful not to reproduce the orders themselves -- amply proved the point. They consisted of a couple of pieces of correspondence between the camp officials at Buchenwald and the directors of a nursing home at Bernburg. In his letter dated February 2, 1942, Dr. Hoven, the camp physician states, with regard to Jewish prisoners who are unfit for work in the camp:

Referring to our personal conversation, I send you, attached, in copy, and to be used for all purposes, a list of those Jews sick and unable to work, now in the camp at Buchenwald.

At this point, it must be noted that the list which is mentioned is not published. The second document is a letter from the nursing home at Bernburg, dated March 5, 1942, in which the writer refers to a letter of March 3, 1942. The text of this letter is as follows:

Subject 36 prisoners, list no. 12 of February 2, 1942.

In our letter of the 3rd current, we asked you to make available to us the last 36 prisoners of the last transport, March 18, 1942.

Because of the absence of our physician-in-chief who is to examine medically these prisoners, we request you not to send them to us on March 18, 1942, but to add them to the March 11, 1942, transport, together with their papers which will be returned to you March 11, 1942.

One must agree that the meaning of the text has to be strangely distorted to deduce from this exchange of correspondence that extermination by means of gas chambers was involved.

These two documents, moreover, call for comment, since they apparently refer to the practice of euthanasia, and since they bear the dates of February 2 and March 5, 1942. Here is the story of operation *Gnadentod*:

On September 1, 1939, Hitler signed the *Gnadentod* order, the text of which is given as follows:

Reichleiter Bouhler and Doctor Brandt are instructed, on their own responsibility, to extend the authority of physicians to designate by name, after a critical examination of their condition, those sick persons who can humanely be called incurable, so that a merciful death may be assured.

When this decree -- which was not restrictive -- was signed, the installation of crematoriums was begun in six sanitariums: that of Hadamar near Limbourg, that of Grafeneck in Wurttemberg, that of Hartheim near Linz, and the homes for the aged at Pirna, Bernberg and Brandenburg. After January, 1940, the transfer of the terminally ill to these establishments began.

During July, 1941, the rumor began to spread in German Catholic circles that some 30,000 ill persons had been subjected to euthanasia contrary to Church doctrine. The priests were aroused, and on July 6, 1941, a pastoral letter of the bishops was read aloud in all of the Catholic churches of Germany, dated June 26, 1941, of which the essential passages are the following:

Most certainly there are commands which do not call for action on our parts if their execution would involve too many difficulties or dangers. But there are also duties of conscience from which no one can free us and which we must carry out, even at the cost of our lives. Never, in any circumstances outside of war and legitimate self defense may an innocent man be killed!

When this pastoral letter which he had energetically promoted had no effect, and the removal of the terminally ill was renewed in his diocese, Monseigneur von Galen, Bishop of Munster, lodged a complaint on July 28, 1941, with the public prosecutor of the Munster Court, invoking articles 139 and 211 of the code which put an obligation on everyone to denounce murder and to oppose it. When this complaint had no effect, Monseigneur von Galen ascended the pulpit on August 3, 1941, in his church Saint-Lambert of Munster, and delivered a ringing sermon.

After recalling earlier protestations of the bishops, and also of his own, and after denouncing a recent removal of one thousand six hundred sick persons from the homes for the aged at Marienthal and Warstein, the Bishop of Munster stated:

Why should these poor defenseless sick people die? Simply because according to the verdict of some doctor or commission they belong in the category of the "unfit to live." It is stated that they can no longer be productive. They are like an old machine that no longer works, an old paralyzed horse, a cow that no longer gives milk! What becomes of an old machine: it is put on the scrap heap. What is done with a paralyzed horse? Unproductive cattle? . . . But it is not a question of old machines, horses or cows. It is a question of men like us, our brothers and our sisters. Woe to man! Woe to our German people if the sacred Commandment: 'Thou shalt not kill' which our Creator engraved from the beginning in the minds of men, is transgressed, and if this transgression is tolerated and goes unpunished...

This sermon had a profound echo all over Germany and started a movement before which Hitler retreated.

Less than a month afterwards, August 20, 1941, Hitler gave the order to suspend operation "*Gnadentod*." All the historians, even the most anti-Nazi, are today agreed on this version of the affair. Even Mr. Gerhard Jaeckel, a specialist on Nazi atrocities and war crimes, in the illustrated Munich weekly *Quick* (June 25, 1961), has confirmed it in every detail as it is reproduced above. And, in Paris, the newspaper *Le Monde* (May 3, 1963) has also accepted the story as it is set forth in the preceding paragraphs.

Now, the two documents that are produced by Eugen Kogon bear the dates of February 2 and of March 5, 1942, when operation "*Gnadentod*" had been terminated for more than six months. A third document that was published by Eugen Kogon in support of these two letters, which is a report from Dr. Hoven, but which has no date, has this to say, according to Kogon:

The obligations of the contracting physicians and the negotiations with the burial services have often led to insurmountable difficulties ... This is why I am at once getting in touch with Doctor Infried-Eberl, head physician of the nursing home of Bernburg-sur-Saale, Post Box 252, telephone 3.169. This is the same physician who carried out operation "14 F 13." Doctor Eberl has shown the greatest kindness. AU the bodies of the prisoners deceased at Schoneberg-Wernigerode will be transported to Doctor Eberl at Bernburg and will be cremated, even without a death certificate. (Page 227)

The least one can say is that this report does not excuse one from the obligation of verifying the authenticity of the three documents . . . if only to find out if, in the Germany of 1942, it was possible to contravene the orders of the *Fuehrer* to this extent.

A procedure called the "*Selektion*", which was periodically performed in all the camps, contributed in no small measure to the dissemination of the notion that executions were common occurrences in the camps. What actually happened was this:

Periodically, the health services of the camps received the order to make up a list of all sick persons who were considered to be unfit for fairly sustained work or for any work at all, and to gather them in a special Block. Then, trucks arrived -- or a line of railway cars -- and they were put in, and they departed for an unknown destination. The rumor in the concentration camps had it that they were taken directly to the gas chambers; as a consequence, with a sort of cruel sense of humor, these assemblings were called *Himmelskommandos*, meaning that they were composed of persons bound for heaven. Naturally all of those who were sick tried to escape the *Himmelskommando*.

I saw two or three "*Selektions*" carried out at Dora; I even escaped being included in one of them. Dora was a small camp. Although the numbers of unfit sick were always greater than the means available to care for them, those numbers only very rarely reached proportions so large as to interfere with the operation or the administration of the camp. Auschwitz-Birkenau, which David Rousset speaks about in the quotation in question, was different. That camp was very large, a human ant-heap, so to speak. The number of unfit was considerable. The "*Selektions*", instead of being made through the health services, often were made on the spot whenever the trucks or rail cars arrived. They took place at a rate of about one a week, and decisions as to who was to be included were made just on appearances. Between the S.S. guards and the concentration camp bureaucracy on the one hand and the mass of prisoners trying to escape selection on the other, one can imagine the confusion of what amounted to manhunts in an atmosphere of universal panic. After each "*Selektion*" those who were left behind felt that they had for the time being escaped the gas chamber.

But, there is nothing to prove conclusively that any of the unfit, or those so designated as unfit, who were selected in this way, either at Dora or at Birkenau, were sent to gas chambers. In support of this statement I want to record a personal experience. In the "*Selektion*" which I escaped at Dora was included one of my comrades who did not have the same luck. I saw him depart, and I was sorry for him. In 1946 I still believed that he was dead and that he had been asphyxiated together with the entire convoy of which he was a part. In September of the same year, to my astonishment, he showed up at my house to invite me to attend some official demonstration. When I told him what my fears for him had been all this time, he told me that the convoy in question had been sent to Bergen-Belsen, a convalescent center for the sick deportees from all the camps. This story is verified by a former deportee, a fellow named Mullin who is now an employee at the Besançon railway station. After a trip that was made under appalling conditions, he arrived at Bergen-Belsen, to which had converged convoys of the unfit from all over Germany. There were so many Prisoners that the camp administration didn't know where to put them or how to feed them. He spent many horrible days there and was finally sent back to work. At Buchenwald, moreover, I had already encountered in Block 48 a Czech who had returned to Birkenau from Bergen-Belsen in the same way.

My view on the gas chambers? Some probably did exist; but not as many as is believed. Moreover, there probably were exterminations by gas, but not as many as has been claimed. The number, of course, does not in the least diminish the nature of the horror, but the fact that the practice might have been a measure that was decreed by a State order in the name of a political doctrine would singularly add to the horrible nature of it. Was that the case? The statement of Dr. Aryeh Kubovy, Director

of the *Center of Jewish Documentation* at Tel-Aviv, which is discussed in Chapter 13, Note 8, concerning the nonexistence of orders for the extermination of the Jews has definitely settled the question in the negative.

Nevertheless, in spite of the fact that there appears to have been no official Nazi policy of gas exterminations, the factor that has played the greatest role in promoting the contrary belief, seems to have been the "*Selektion*" practice about which there is not a deportee who cannot speak as a witness in one way or another, and who does so, mainly, in terms of all that he feared at the moment.

Two other documents that are quoted by David Rousset in *Le Pitre ne rit pas* (1949) in support of the existence of mass exterminations by gas do not strike me as any more convincing than those of Eugen Kogon. The first is a deposition of a certain Wolfgang Grosch at Nuremberg and is about the construction of gas chambers, but not their use. The second, concerning trucks that had been fitted with asphyxiating mechanisms which were to have been used in Russia, bears the signature of a second-Lieutenant and is addressed to a Lieutenant. Neither one of them allows one to accuse the leaders of the Nazi regime of having given orders for the extermination by gas. The text of both documents will be found in Appendix C at the end of this book.

Speaking of Auschwitz-Birkenau, Eugen Kogon had said that toward the end of 1942 the Third Reich was contemplating the installation of a branch of I.G. Farben Industries at the camp, in which the use of chemical gasses would be indispensable, and I suggest that from this fact might have sprung the accusation that the *Reich* had decided to exterminate Jews in this way. [3] Of course, it is only a supposition. But in history as in the sciences, have not most discoveries stemmed, if not from supposition, at least from doubt?

It may be objected that there is nothing to be gained in exonerating National-Socialism in this way, whose misdeeds in other respects are definitely established. In response, I believe that there is nothing more to be gained in supporting a doctrine or an interpretation, perhaps correct, but which rests on falsities. All of the great principles of democracy die, not because of their substance, but from being too exposed in details considered as insignificant in their scope as in their substance, and dictatorships generally only triumph to the extent that insufficiently studied arguments are brandished against them. In this connection, David Rousset gives an example which in a masterly manner illustrates this way of looking at things:

I was talking with a German physician ... He was obviously not a Nazi. He was fed up with the war and did not know where his wife and four children were. Dresden, which had been his home, had been cruelly bombed, "Look here," he said to me, "did we go to war for Danzig?" I answered no. "All right then, Hitler's policy in the concentration camps was frightful (I bowed); but, for the rest, he was right." (Page 170)

So, by this little detail, because it was felt to be wrong to be told that they were going to war for Danzig, and that that turned out to be false, this doctor pronounced judgment on Hitler's entire policy and approved of it. I wonder in fear what he thinks of that policy now, now that he has had a chance to read David Rousset and Eugen Kogon.

V. Traduttore, Traditore

This small detail is without great significance; David Rousset sets forth his opinion as to the etymology of the word "*Kapo*" as follows:

The expression *Kapo* is probably of Italian origin and means the head: there are two other possible explanations: *Kapo*, abbreviation of *Kaporal*, or a contraction of the phrase *Kamerad Polizei*, used during the first months of Buchenwald. (Page 131)

Eugen Kogon on the other hand is more positive:

Kapo: *Il capo*, the head, the chief... (*L'Enfer organisé*, page 59)

I suggest another explanation: the word is derived from the phrase *Konzentrationslager Arbeit Polizei*, using the initials of each word, just as *Schupo* comes from *Schutz Polizei* and *Gestapo* from *Geheim Staat Polizei*. The haste of David Rousset and Eugen Kogon to interpret, rather than analyze, prevented them from thinking of it.

FOOTNOTES

1. In German, the camps were called *Schutzhaftlager*, camps for prisoners being protected (against the people's fury.)
2. He was given this title by the Ruling Clique; his name was Marcel Paul.
3. [Auschwitz and its satellite camps became, by the end of the war, a huge industrial complex where both prisoner and free labor worked in a variety of industrial enterprises, among which were extensive chemical works which manufactured from the coal of the region synthetic gasoline and "Buna" (synthetic rubber.) For a detailed discussion, see Arthur R. Butz, *The Hoax of the Twentieth Century* (Richmond, Surrey: Historical Review Press, [1976]), pages 47-52.]

Chapter Eleven

Eugen Kogon and *L'Enfer organisé*

I am not acquainted with Eugen Kogon. I learned all that I know about him from what he says about himself in his book and from what I have read in the book reviews.

Unless I am mistaken, Kogon is an Austrian journalist of the Christian social or Christian progressive variety who was arrested following the *Anschluss* and who was deported to Buchenwald. He is known to the French public as a sociologist.

L'Enfer organisé has had more success than any other concentration camp memoir. It covers a considerable number of facts and events, most of which were experienced by the author himself. Although Kogon is to some extent naive and is somewhat prone to exaggerate, his main weakness lies in his explanations and interpretations. These weaknesses are the result, on the one hand, of Kogon's insistence at looking at things "in their political light" (Preface, page 14) and, on the other hand, of his desire to justify the conduct of the *Häftlingsführung*. His vindication of the concentration camp bureaucracy is done in an even more categorical and explicit manner than the "whitewash" that was done by David Rousset.

Otherwise, Eugen Kogon writes his report, so he says, "without any regard for the consequences... as a man and a Christian" (Preface, page 14), and without any intention of writing a comprehensive "history of the German concentration camps" or "a compilation of all of the horrors that were found in them; but rather a work essentially sociological in character, whose human content, both political and moral, established in its authenticity, has the value of an example." (Introduction, page 20).

The intention was good. He believed himself to be qualified for that mission, and, perhaps, he was. He describes himself as, "...having spent at least five years in captivity... having climbed up under the most painful circumstances, little by little reaching a position where he could see things clearly and exercise influence... as never having belonged to the camp police stooges... as never having dishonored himself in his conduct as a prisoner." (Page 20)

After having been detailed for one year to the *Effecktenkammer Kommando* (the workshop where clothing was made), a privileged job, he became secretary to the S.S. camp physician, Doctor Ding-Schuller, an even more privileged job. In this job he was in a position to become acquainted in detail with all of the intrigues of the camp which occurred during the last two years of his internment.

After reading it, I closed the book. Then I opened it again, and under the heading of the title page I wrote, as a subtitle: *Plaidoyer pro domo* (plea in self-defense).

I. The Prisoner Eugen Kogon

At Buchenwald there was a "Section for the study of typhus and viruses." It occupied Blocks 46 and 50. In charge of this laboratory was the S.S. camp physician, Doctor Ding-Schuller. This is the way it operated:

In Block 46 at Buchenwald camp which was a model of cleanliness, and very well managed experiments were not only carried out on the men, but all the typhus cases were isolated, those who had contracted it in the camp as a matter of course, and those who had been brought to the camp when they were already affected. They were cured there, insofar as they could weather this terrible sickness. The running of the Block had been put in the hands of Arthur Dietzch... one of the prisoners...*who had gotten his medical knowledge only through this experience.* [2] Dietzch was a Communist who had been a political prisoner for nearly twenty years. [3] He was a very hardened person, naturally one of the most hated and feared at Buchenwald. [4]

Since the S.S. and the under-officers of the camp had an unconquerable fear of contagion, and since they thought typhus could be picked up simply by contact, in the air, from the cough of someone sick, etc... they never went into Block 46... The prisoners took advantage of that, in collaboration with *Kapo* Dietzch: the illegal management of the camp made use of this, on the one hand, to get rid of those who were collaborating with the S.S. against the prisoners (or who seemed to be collaborating, or who were just plain unpopular),[5] on the other hand, to conceal in Block 46 certain important political prisoners whose lives were threatened, which was sometimes very difficult and very dangerous for Dietzch, since his servants and nurses were all "greens." (Page 162, emphasis added.)

In Block 50, a vaccine was made up for exanthematous typhus, from the lungs of mice and rabbits, in line with the procedure of Professor Giroud (of Paris). This was begun in August 1943. The camp's best specialists, doctors, bacteriologists, serum specialists, chemists, were chosen for this work, etc... (Page 163)

And this is how Eugen Kogon got assigned to his position.

One of the crafty political aims of the prisoners, from the beginning, was to bring into this *Kommando* comrades of every nationality, whose lives were threatened, since the S.S. had as respectful a fear of this Block as of Block 46. This fetishist fear on the part of the S.S. was sustained as much by S.S. Dr. Ding-Schuller, as by the prisoners, but for different reasons (for example, by posting bulletins on the barbed wire that isolated the Block). Candidates for death, such as the Dutch physician Van Lingen, the architect Harry Pieck and other Netherlands, the Polish doctor, Dr. Marian Ciepielowski (production chief in this service), Professor Dr. Balachowsky, of the Pasteur Institute at Paris, the author of this work, in his capacity as an Austrian publicist, and seven Jewish comrades, found refuge in this Block, *with Dr. Ding-Schuller's approval* (Page 163, emphasis added.)

It must be admitted that Eugen Kogon had put himself in serious pawn to the "Communist" nucleus that was preponderant in the camp -- in the face of other "green" groups, politicals and even *Communists!* -- in order to get assigned by them to this position of confidence. And, that assignment was made "with the approval of Doctor Ding-Schuller" it must be remembered. Now this is what he could do in this position:

As a result of the requests which, every time, I suggested, drew up, and presented for signature, they were protected from sudden roundups, extermination transports, etc...(Page 183)

During the last two years which I spent as secretary to the doctor, I wrote out, with the help of the specialist of Block 50, at least half a dozen medical communications on exanthematous typhus ...which were signed by Dr. Schuller. I will mention only in passing that I was also assigned to take care of a part of his private correspondence, including love and condolence letters. Often, he did not even read the answers; he threw me the letters after having opened them, and said to me, "Fix that up, Kogon. You know what to reply. It's some widow looking for consolation..." (Page 270)

And, he could state, "I had Dr. Ding-Schuller in the palm of my hand," (Page 218), and to such an extent that the fact that he was "on bad terms with the *Kapo* of Block 46" did not disturb him at all.

Clearly, on the basis of the preceding quotations, Kogon knew how to get into the graces of the influential clique in the *Häftlingsführung*, while, at the same time, staying in the graces of one of the highest S.S. authorities of the camp. All of those persons who have lived in a concentration camp will agree that such a position could not be engineered without infringing upon the rules of morality which are customarily observed outside the camps.

II. The Method

In order to dispel certain fears, and to show that this report [that is what he calls his *Enfer organisé*] cannot be construed as an accusation against certain prisoners who held dominant positions, I read it aloud, at the beginning of the month of May 1945, as soon as it was down on paper, lacking only the last two chapters out of a total of twelve, to a group of fifteen people, who had been members of the clandestine government of the camp,[6] or who represented certain political alignments among the prisoners. These persons approved its accuracy and its objectivity. Present at the reading were:

1. Walter Bartel, Communist from Berlin, president of the international committee in the camp.
2. Heinz Baumeister, Social, from Dortmund, who for years had been a member of the Buchenwald Secretariat; second secretary of Block 50.

3. Ernst Busse, Communist, from Solingen, *Kapo* of the prisoners' infirmary.
4. Boria Banilenko, head of Communist youth groups in the Ukraine, member of the Russian committee.
5. Hans Eiden, Communist, from Trier, first camp elder.
6. Baptiste Feflen, Communist, from Aix-la-Chapelle, washhouse *Kapo*.
7. Franz Hackel, Left independent, from Prague. One of our friends, without position in the camp.
8. Stephan Heymann, Communist, from Mannheim, member of camp information office.
9. Werner Hilpert, Centrist, from Leipzig, member of the international committee in the camp.
10. Otto Horn, Communist, from Vienna, member of the Austrian committee.
11. A. Kaltschin, Russian prisoner of war, member of the Russian committee.
12. Otto Kipp, Communist, from Dresden, assistant *Kapo* of the prisoners' infirmary.
13. Ferdinand Romhild, Communist, from Frankfurt am Main, first secretary of the prisoners' infirmary.
14. Ernst Thappe, Social, head of the German committee.
15. Walter Wolff, Communist, head of the camp information office. (Page 20-21)

This perfunctory statement, in itself, is enough to render suspect the entire testimony: "In order to dispel certain fears, and to show that this report cannot be construed as an accusation against certain prisoners who held dominant positions in the -- camp... " Thus has Eugen Kogon avoided reporting anything accusatory against the *Häftlingsführung*; rather, he harbored grievances only against the S.S. No historian could ever accept that. On the contrary, one is justified in thinking that in this way he has paid a debt of gratitude to those who got him his privileged positions in the camp and that he has chosen to defend those with whom he had common interests, as well as himself, before the public.

And, besides, the fifteen persons listed who passed judgment on his "accuracy and objectivity" are suspect. They are all Communists or fellow-travelers, and if, by chance, there was an exception, he could only be under obligation to the others. Lastly, the list is made up of the highest functionaries of the *Häftlingsführung* of Buchenwald who, naturally, are likely to share Kogon's point of view.

I consider such titles as "president" or "member" of this or that "committee" with which they are tricked out to be meaningless. They awarded such titles to themselves at the time of the liberation of the camp by the Americans, or even afterwards. And, I pay little attention to the notion of "committees", for reasons which I have dealt with elsewhere. As I see it, these fifteen persons were only too happy to find in Eugen Kogon an artful pen with which to free them from all the responsibility for their actions in the camp in the eyes of posterity.

III. The *Häftlingsführung*.

It had the following duties: to maintain order in the camp; to maintain discipline in order to avoid the intervention of the S.S., etc...this made it possible to do away with the S.S. patrols in the camp; their task was to receive the new arrivals, this little by little eliminated the brutal wrangling of the S.S. It was a difficult and thankless job. The guards of Buchenwald camp very rarely struck blows, although there were often savage rows. The new arrivals, who came from other camps, were terrified at first when they were met by those who were guards at camp Buchenwald, but later they always came to appreciate how much better their reception had been than in other places...To be sure there was always this or that member of the camp guard who, judging by his way of expressing himself, ought to have been an S.S. But that didn't matter much. The aim alone counted: *To keep a nucleus of prisoners against the S.S.* If the camp guard had not seen to an impeccable appearance of order in front of the S.S., what might not have become of the entire camp, and its thousands of prisoners, in the line of punitive labors and, *last but not least*, during the last days before liberation? (Page 62, emphasis added)

Looking back on my personal experience and on the reception that my convoy received at the two different camps, it is not possible for me to concede that it was any better at Buchenwald than it was at Dora. But, I must also acknowledge that conditions in general at Buchenwald and at Dora were not to be compared: the first was a sanatorium when compared to the second. But, to conclude that the relatively better conditions of Buchenwald were due to a difference in the make-up, the nature, and the political and philosophical convictions between the two *Häftlingsführung* would be an error. If they had been transposed *en bloc*, the result would have been the same. In both cases, their behavior was governed by the overall conditions of existence in each camp, and over these factors they had no control.

At the time of which Eugen Kogon is speaking, Buchenwald was at the end of its evolution. Almost everything had been completed: the various services were installed and things were in order. The S.S. guards themselves, having to face fewer of the worries that always accompany disorder, settled into a routine that was almost without mishaps; in short, their nerves were much less on edge. At Dora, on the other hand, the camp was in full construction; everything had to be built and put into place with the limited resources of a country at war. Disorder was the natural state of things. Everything was in a jumble. The S.S. were unapproachable, and the *Häftlingsführung*, not knowing what to do to please them, often exceeded their desires. But, at Buchenwald, the exactions of a *Kapo* or a camp elder, identical in their motives and

aims, were less comprehensive, because, with conditions in every way better, the consequences were not so serious for the mass of the prisoners.

As additional support for this contention, is the fact that in the fall of 1944, when Dora was, in its turn, almost completed, and with the *Häftlingsführung* having in no way modified its conduct, the material and moral conditions there could stand comparison with Buchenwald. Unfortunately, at that moment the end of the war was imminent, the bombings had interfered -- with the getting of supplies, and the advance of the Allies on two fronts had caused the overpopulation of Dora with prisoners who had been evacuated from camps in the East and the West. As a consequence, everything in the camp was in turmoil again.

There remains to be discussed the line of reasoning according to which it was important, in order to maintain a nucleus against the S.S., to substitute a prisoner bureaucracy for them. But, since the whole camp was naturally against the S.S., I do not understand this reasoning. It could be argued that it would have been better to keep everyone *alive* to oppose the S.S. guards, and not just a nucleus of prisoners who were under their orders, if only to create extra difficulties for them... Instead of that, a method was used which, while it saved that precious nucleus, it killed the mass. As Eugen Kogon recognizes, after David Rousset, urbanity was not the only thing that came into the discussion:

In fact, the prisoners never received the scant rations which were in principle meant for them. First, the S.S. took what they pleased. Then the prisoners who worked in the food storehouses and in the kitchens worked it so they could set apart an ample share. Then the heads of the barracks diverted a good lot for themselves and for their friends. The rest went to the miserable ordinary prisoners. (Page 107)

There is room here to point out that everyone who had a shred of authority in the camp was by that very fact in a position to "set apart": the camp elder who delivered the rations in bulk; the *Kapo* and the Block chief who helped themselves copiously in the first place; the foreman and the ward keeper who cut the bread or put soup into the bowls; the police; the secretary, etc... It is strange that Kogon does not mention this fact. All of these people literally gorged themselves on what they stole, and walked around the camp with prosperous appearances. Not the slightest scruple stopped them:

In the prisoners' infirmary in the camps there was special food for the sick, which was called "the diet." It was very much sought after as a supplement, and most of it was diverted to the profit of the camp personages: Block elders, *Kapos*, etc... In every camp could be found *communists or criminals who for years received in addition to their other advantages, the extras for the sick*. It was above all a matter of good relations with the kitchen for the sick, composed exclusively of people belonging to that category of prisoners who dominated the camp, or of an exchange of services rendered: the *Kapos* of the sewing shop, cobbler, clothing storehouse, tool house, etc..., turned over, in exchange for this food, what was asked of them. In Buchenwald, from 1939 to 1941, nearly forty thousand eggs were made away with in this way, right inside the camp. (Pages 110-112, emphasis added.)

Meanwhile, the sick in the infirmary were dying from the lack of this special food which the S.S. had intended for them. In explaining the mechanics of the thievery, Kogon just calls it an aspect of "system D", indiscriminately used by all of the prisoners who were involved with the distribution of the food. Such a characterization is both inaccurate and charitable, with regard to the *Häftlingsführung*.

The worker, in whatever *Kommando*, could not steal, because the *Kapo* and the foreman, all set to denounce him, watched him very closely. At the most when the distribution of rations was made, he could risk taking something from one of his fellow sufferers. But, the *Kapo* and the foreman, working together, could set aside something from the supply of rations, before distribution, and this they cynically did. And this "setting aside" was done with impunity, too, because they could not be denounced except through the chain of command, that is, through themselves. They stole for themselves, for their friends, for those in authority to whom they were indebted for their positions, and, in the higher ranks of the hierarchy, for the S.S., from whom they hoped to keep or get protection.

As for the diet of the sick, the *Kapo* of the infirmary -- the very one who attested to the accuracy and the objectivity of Kogon's testimony -- expropriated a considerable quantity for the benefit of his colleagues and the accredited Communists. [7] During my stay at Buchenwald, every morning he set aside some milk, about a liter, and some other delicacies, for Erich, chief of Block 48. Multiply this example of plunder by the number of persons in the whole camp, who also had the opportunity to steal, and one can see the amount of milk which the sick in the infirmary never received. Compared to this kind of theft, the petty scroungings along the food distribution circuit were insignificant.

Thus, whether it is a question of the normal rations or the "diet" for the sick, the common mass of prisoners had two reasons for dying of hunger: the food that was taken by the S.S. and the food that was taken by the *Häftlingsführung*. The rank and file prisoners also had two reasons for being beaten and for being maltreated in general: the *Kapo* who stole extra, also hit harder to please the S.S. and it was rare when a simple reprimand from a S.S. guard did not bring on, in addition, a whole rain of blows from the *Kapo*. Given these conditions, there were few prisoners who did not prefer to deal directly with the S.S.

IV. The Arguments

The arguments that are used to justify the protection of a nucleus of "elite" prisoners at the expense of the common masses of prisoners are in no way more convincing than the facts. Without this prisoner elite, "what would have become of the entire camp, especially at the moment of liberation?" Kogon asks himself fearfully. From what has been said, it is already clear that the common prisoners would have had one less reason to die ("*crever*") at the rate they were dying. It is not enough of an answer for him to add, "It was thus that the first American tanks, coming from the Northwest, found Buchenwald liberated," (Page 304) and to give the credit for that liberation to the *Häftlingsführung*. To make such an assertion does not make it true. With such an argument, one could also say that the American Army entered a liberated France, and

that, too, would be ridiculous. The truth of the matter is that the S.S. withdrew before the American advance, and, trying to take with them as many prisoners as possible, they set the *Häftlingsführung* personnel, bludgeons in hand, to round up as many prisoners as possible throughout the camp.

Thanks to the willing cooperation of the *Häftlingsführung*, the manhunt took place with a minimum of disorder. And, if by some miraculous chance the American offensive had been stopped before the camp, and a vigorous German counteroffensive had reversed the outcome of the war, this reasoning would offer a sure advantage as revealed in these lines:

The S.S. staffs of the camps were not capable of enforcing on tens of thousands of prisoners more than an outward and sporadic control. (Page 275)

In other words, with a victorious Germany each member of the *Häftlingsführung* of the camp could have pleaded his personal contribution to the maintenance of order and his loyalty, in an effort to obtain his liberation. And, the lines that we have just read could have appeared without the changing of a comma.

Through ceaseless struggle, the system of the S.S., to mix together the various categories of prisoners, to encourage natural antagonisms and to provoke artificial ones, had to be broken and made inoperable. The reasons for that were clear to the reds. With the greens it was not at all political reasons; they wanted to be able to have a free course for their customary practices: corruption, extortion, the seeking of material advantages. Any control was insupportable to them, especially that from within the camp itself. (Page 278)

It is obvious that no matter what system the S.S. used it had to become inoperable from the moment when, used by others for the same purposes, it was applied to the same object and in the same way. Even more: it was useless. The S.S. no longer had any need to hit men, since those to whom they had delegated their power did the hitting better; nor to steal, since their minions stole better and the benefits were the same, if not more substantial; nor to kill slowly to make order respected, because others did that for them, and order in the camp was all the more perfect for it.

In spite of what Kogon says, I never observed that the intervention of the camp bureaucracy had any effect on the "natural antagonisms" between prisoners or that the various categories of prisoners were less "mixed together" than had been intended by the S.S.

Moreover, the integration of the whole prisoner population was not the objective of the *Häftlingsführung*, rather, to divide and rule, a principle that holds for any power wanting to maintain itself, was just as valid for the camp bureaucracy as for the S.S. In practice, while the latter vaguely set the mass of prisoners against those they had chosen to rule them, the former played with political nuances, with the nature of the crime, and with the selection of a nucleus of men of a certain mentality.

What is amusing -- from a distance -- in Kogon's thesis, is the distinction he drew between the "reds" and the "greens" concerning the manner in which each group exercised its power, accusing the latter of corruption, bribery, and self-seeking. What

did the "reds" do that was not all of that? And, for the ordinary prisoner, what difference did it make to him who was in power, when it was impossible for him to see any resulting difference.

What happened in the concentration camps was that in the struggle to keep alive, appetites more or less understandable took precedence over all moral principles. At the bottom of everything was the basic desire to survive. Along with this desire, among, the less scrupulous, went the need to steal food, and then the need to clan together in order to steal food better. Those who were the most skillful at organizing in order to get better nourishment -- i.e., the politicals, since under the circumstances the task of organizing called more for cleverness than strength -- were then the most able to obtain power, because they were better fed. And once in power, they were also better able to hold onto it, because they were intellectually more adept. But, no moral principle, in the sense that it is understood in the world outside of the concentration camps, played any part in this evolution, except by its absence. And, then to write:

In every camp the political prisoners tried to take in hand the internal administrative machinery or, as the case might be, struggled to hold onto it. This in order *to defend itself by every means* against the S.S., not just to fight the hard battle for life, but also to further, insofar as possible, the disintegration and crushing of the system. In more than one camp, the leaders of the political prisoners, for years, worked at this end, with admirable perseverance, and complete contempt for death. (Page 275, emphasis added.)

This statement is only pap, whose laudatory tone fails to hide the fact that it puts all of the political prisoners -- even those who never wanted to exercise any authority over their fellow sufferers -- in a class with the least scrupulous of them. Nor, does the admission "*defend itself by every means...*" help either. "By every means:" this is what that could mean:

When the S.S. asked the politicals to make a selection of those prisoners "unfit to live," [9] in order to kill them, and that a refusal might have meant the end of the control of the reds and a return of the greens, then they had to be prepared to take the burden of that transgression. Their only choice lay between taking an active participation in that selection, or a possible withdrawal of their responsibilities in the camp, which, after all that had already been experienced, could have had even worse consequences. The more tender the conscience, the harder it was to make this decision. But since it had to be made, and without delay, it was better for it to lie in the hands of those of strong constitution, so that we would not all be made martyrs. (Page 327)

I have already remarked that it was not a question of selecting the unfit *to live*, but, rather, the unfit *for work*. The difference is considerable. If one wants to overlook it at any cost, I submit that it would have been better to "risk a possible (10) withdrawal of their responsibilities in the camp" than to have burdened their collective conscience with this "active participation" that was always so zealously carried out. Maybe, the "greens" would have come back to power? But, so what? In the first place, they were not likely to have retained it. And, in the second place, the "greens" would not have behaved any worse than the "reds" with regard to the mass of the prisoners. They would not have selected any greater number of prisoners as unfit; nor would they have

taken any less account of the background of the designated prisoners, because, in these selections, the "reds" were no less concerned than the "greens" over political caste. The fact was that the *Häftlingsführung*, whether "green" or "red," used the selection procedure as a method of getting rid of potential rivals.

Consequently, and, if it meant assuming the same moral burden, why take power away from the "greens," or seek to prevent them from holding it? It is possible that with the "greens" in power, the selection of the unfit, with a few exceptions, might not have been the same. But, nothing would have been changed as far as the number of unfit was concerned, since that figure was determined by the general work statistics and the amount of provisions available in the camp for the support of non-working prisoners. Under such circumstances, Eugen Kogon himself might perhaps not have been in a position to become, or to remain, the secretary and aide-de-camp to the S.S. camp physician Dr. Ding-Schuller, and, once returned to the mass of common prisoners, and once beaten and starved, perhaps he, too, might have been included among the number of those found to be "unfit." Probably the same thing could have happened to the fifteen others who sanctioned his testimony. Then, had this most unthinkable of catastrophes actually occurred, only this could have happened: these fifteen would have been "made martyrs," while others would have continued to live as witnesses.

As if it mattered to History whether Kogon and his associates or some others were witnesses, like Michelin de Clermont, Fernand, Francois de Tessen, Doctor Seguin, Crémieux, Desnos, among others... When Kogon said "so that we would not all be made martyrs," he was referring, of course, only to the privileged prisoners among the *Häftlingsführung*, and not to all of the politicals who, in spite of what has been said, made up the majority of the prison population. Not for an instant did Kogon think that by being satisfied with eating less and with beating less, the concentration camp bureaucracy could have saved almost all of the prisoners; if that had happened, today we would reap only benefits in that they too would be witnesses.

How could a man as informed as Kogon, and affecting a degree of culture, have arrived at such garbled conclusions? The reason may be seen in the fact that he tried to judge the prisoners and guards, and the events that took place in the world of the concentration camp, by the standards of the outside world. We do the same thing when we form an opinion about what is taking place in the Soviet Union or in Red China, based on the moral codes of the western world, and the Russians and the Chinese do the same to us. On both sides of the "Iron Curtain," an Order has been created, and making it function has given rise to a type of men whose conceptions of social life and of individual conduct are different and, indeed, even opposite in nature.

The same is true of the concentration camps: ten years of existence were enough to create an Order within the camps, and all must be judged on its terms. In particular, this Order gave rise to a new type of man, who can be classed somewhere between the common prisoner and the political prisoner. The characteristic feature of this new type of man resulted from the fact that the common prisoner corrupted the political prisoner, made him almost like the former, without troubling his conscience very much. It was to this level that the camp was reduced by those who had conceived of it. The camp gave direction to the reactions of all of the prisoners, "green" or "red," and not the reverse. With this fact established -- and to the extent that one is willing to

admit that it is not a mental fabrication -- the moral code of the world outside the concentration camps can pardon what happened in the camps, but it can in no case justify what happened there.

V. The Conduct of the S.S.

I put side by side two statements:

Those prisoners who maltreated their comrades, or even beat them to death, were certainly never punished by the S.S. but were turned over to the justice of the prisoners. (Page 98)

One morning a prisoner was found hanged in a Block. An investigation was started and it was seen that the "hanged" man had died after having been horribly beaten and trampled on, and that the barracks man, under the direction of the Block elder Osterloh, [11] had then hanged him to make it look like a suicide. The victim had protested against a misappropriation of bread by the barracks man. The S.S. staff *succeeded* [12] in hushing the matter up and put the murderer back in his post so that nothing was changed. (Page 50)

It is true that the S.S. personnel did not usually intervene in the disputes among the prisoners and that one waited in vain for any pronouncement of justice from them. It could not be otherwise, since "they did not know what was actually happening behind the barbed wire." (Page 275) The reason for this ignorance on the part of the S.S. was that the *Häftlingsführung* made every effort to see to it that they were kept in the dark concerning the day to day happenings in the camp. By setting itself up as a veritable "court of prisoners," and by profiting from the fact that no appeal could be made against its decisions, the *Häftlingsführung* never had need for recourse to the S.S. except to strengthen its own authority if it felt that it was weakening. In any case, the camp bureaucrats did not like to see the intervention of the S.S. for fear that the S.S. would be less severe, a situation which would have brought their authority into question with the mass of prisoners. In addition, such intervention might have caused the S.S. to question their ability to govern, which, in turn, might have caused them to be relieved from their duties and to be returned to the rank and file. As a practical matter, there existed an implicit operating procedure between the *Häftlingsführung* and the S.S.: the *Häftlingsführung* "avoided trouble" by preventing the various camp happenings from seeping through the screen of its own edifice, and the S.S. made no attempt to know what was going on in the camp as long as order was maintained.

In the specific case which Kogon mentions, if Block Chief Osterloh had been a "red," nothing concerning the matter would have reached the ears of the S.S. other than the fact that the victim had been a suicide, a fact which would not have resulted in any difficulties. But, he was a "green", and he represented one of the last elements of power which his category still held in the camp. The "reds" denounced him in the hope of getting rid of him. However, the S.S. did not settle the matter in the way that they had hoped. This is the way of the Order: a Block Chief, even guilty, could not be questioned or punished except by some higher authority, and, in no case, could he be

punished from the prisoner masses. Whether a "green" or a "red," that is the way that it was.

One can reverse the facts of the preceding example and make Osterloh the victim, and his victim the murderer. In such a case, the *Häftlingsführung* itself would have reacted this way: without worrying about Osterloh's color, it would have felt itself attacked or threatened in its prerogatives and would have sent for the S.S. -- demanding an exemplary punishment unless, which is more likely, it had first given the punishment -- in which case it would only have asked the S.S. to approve it. In the first situation, the S.S. would forward the matter to a higher echelon and would wait for a decision. In the meantime, blows would rain down from everywhere on the murderer as he would be taken to the *Bunker* (13) where he would be subjected to further corporal punishment. In the second situation, the S.S. would endorse the action of the *Häftlingsführung*, precisely to avoid the demands for explanations, and the sundry other difficulties, that would be forthcoming from that higher echelon. In both cases, nothing would happen that was not compatible with the Order.

The authorities in Berlin had to intervene in the Osterloh affair, to which the "reds" had imprudently given the character of a matter of conscience in which honesty attacked the Order; this intervention stirred up so many difficulties that the S.S. staff at Buchenwald had no choice but to *succeed* in hushing the matter up. Besides, generally speaking, the S.S. staff personnel did not like to refer matters to Berlin. They feared the delays, the unaccustomed attention, indeed the scruples, which could cause troubles, the chief one being the transfer to another unit, which in war time could be most consequential. In order to hush things up, Berlin was kept in almost complete ignorance of what was happening and was informed only of what could not be concealed. The S.S. staff of Buchenwald exercised maximum control on the spot.

To the reader who might think that I have exaggerated with regard to the state of ignorance of the authorities in Berlin, permit me to point to the present situation in France. There, the Ministers of Justice and of National Education do not know what really takes place in the prisons, and the so-called houses of correction. For example, the disciplinary practices of the minor prison authorities are generally in constant and flagrant violation of the official regulations, and no one -- either in the Ministries or among the general public -- knows anything about it, except when there is an occasional scandal. And so it is in every country in the world that there is a "universe" of delinquents living on the fringe of the other, lifers, of whom the *chaouch* is king. Within the limits of that "universe" are also the colonial peoples; and the Colonial Ministers and the Ministers of War, to whom they are subject, are also generally ignorant of the conduct of their adjutants, unless, and until, some particularly abhorrent behavior on the part of their subordinates comes to light which, because of political considerations, cannot be ignored.

And, here is another citation from Kogon which is just as significant:

Visits of the S.S. frequently took place in the camps. When this happened, the S.S. staff went through an astonishing procedure: on the one hand they concealed all side structures; On the other they organized regular displays. Anything that might have led anyone to suspect that the prisoners were tortured was passed over in silence by the guides, and they were concealed. It

was in this manner that the famous torture rack which was on the mustering grounds was hidden in one of the barracks until the visitors left. It seems that once they overlooked these prudent measures: when a visitor asked what the thing was, one of the camp chiefs answered that it was a carpentry model for making special forms. The gallows and the stakes on which the prisoners were hanged were also put out of sight each time. The visitors were conducted through "model - installations:" infirmary, cinema, kitchen, library, stores, laundry, and the agriculture section. If they actually went into a block, it was where the barbers and the servants of the S.S. and a few privileged prisoners lived "detached," blocks which for that reason were never over crowded and were always clean. In the kitchen garden as well as in the sculpture workshop, the S.S. visitors sometimes received presents as souvenirs. (Page 258)

This description is of Buchenwald. If one wants to know who these visitors were, we have this:

There were group visits, and visits of individuals. The latter were especially frequent during the vacations, when the S.S. showed the camp to their friends or relatives. These were also for the most part S.S. personnel or heads of the S.A., sometimes also officers of the *Wehrmacht* or the police. The group visits were of different kinds. We frequently saw batches of police or gendarme promotions from a near-by station, or batches of S.S. aspirants. After the war began, visits from officers of the *Luftwaffe*. From time to time, we also had visits from civilians. Once to Buchenwald there came youth delegations from the Fascist countries, who had come together at Weimar for some "cultural congress." Groups of the Hitler youth also came to the camp. Distinguished visitors, such as Gauleiter Sauckel, police commissioner Hennicke of Weimar, Prince Waldeck Pyrmont, Count Ciano, Italian minister of foreign affairs, commanding officers of military divisions, Doctor Conti, and other visitors in that class, more often than not stayed until the evening roll-call. (Page 257)

Thus were carefully hidden all traces of brutality not only from the general run of visitors, but also from those visitors who held the highest positions in the S.S. and in the Third Reich. I imagine that when these personages inspected Dachau and Birkenau, as well as other camps, explanations as pertinent as that which was given for the alleged torture rack at Buchenwald would have been given them for the alleged gas chambers at Birkenau. And, I ask this question: how can it be maintained after all this, that all of the horrors of which the camps were the stage were part of a plan that had been conceived "in high places?"

When, in spite of all that was kept hidden, the authorities in Berlin discovered something awry in the administration of the camps, the S.S. staffs were called to account. An example is provided by a directive coming from the Chief of Section D, dated April 4. 1942:

The *Reichsführer* of the S.S. and Chief of the German police, has directed that concerning his orders for the bastonade (this applies to men as well as to women in preventive detention) it will be proper in cases where the word "aggravated" is attached, to apply the punishment on the naked posterior. In all

other cases, the method customary up to the present will be used in conformity with previous instructions from the S.S. *Reichsführer*.

Eugen Kogon, who cites this circular, adds:

In principle, before applying the bastonade, the camp staff had to ask approval from Berlin, and the camp physician had to certify to the S.S. W.V.H. that the prisoner was in good health. But it had been the custom for a long time in all the camps, right to the end in a great many of them, to send the prisoner first to the "rack" and to give him as many blows as was judged good. Then, after getting approval from Berlin, they began again, but this time officially. (Page 99)

It goes without saying that the bastonade was almost always applied to the naked posterior, and that it was to combat this abuse, and not to aggravate the punishment, that the directive in question was sent to all of the camps.

One can certainly be astonished and find it barbarous that the bastonade played any part in the punishment of the prisoners in the camps. But, the reason for its use is another story: in a country like Germany where until the end of the First World War it was prescribed as the most lenient of punishments, under the name of "*Schlag*," it is not so surprising that its use was retained by the National Socialists for the punishment of major criminals, especially when we remember that the government of the Weimar Republic was not disturbed by its use. On the other hand, it is more astonishing -- in view of the reams of French governmental circulars that have denied the use of the bastonade for almost a century -- that thousands of Negroes in the French colonies continue to suffer such punishment, and in actual fact suffer it "with naked posterior," since they have the misfortune, in addition, to live in those regions of the earth where they would have no reason to clothe themselves except for protection from the bastonade.

Another directive, dated December 28, 1942, emanating from the central S.S. office concerned with economic administration and bearing the signature of General Kludre of the S.S. and the *Waffen S.S.*, says:

... The camp doctors should supervise the food of the prisoners more than they have up to the present, and in agreement with the administration, they should submit to the commanding officer of the camp their suggestions for improvement. The latter should not just remain on paper, but be regularly checked by the camp physicians. It is necessary that the mortality rate be appreciably lowered in each camp, since the number of the prisoners must be brought back to the level required by the *Reichsführer S.S.* The head doctors of the camp shall do everything possible to achieve this. The best doctor in a concentration camp is not the one who thinks it helpful to call attention to himself through uncalled for harshness, but the one who maintains to the highest possible degree the capacity for work in every shop, by keeping an eye on the health of the workers, and in making adjustments. (Pages 111, 141)

As was mentioned in the previous chapter, David Rousset published a collection of documents relating to alleged German atrocities of all sorts under the title *Le Pitre ne*

rit pas; however, Rousset does not discuss the second of the two documents that are cited above because it destroys much of his argument. He does cite the first document, but he does so in a completely twisted sense. In this respect, although there are reasons for distrusting Kogon's interpretations, we must rejoice in the fact that he was objective enough to include the second. Perhaps, there may exist more documents which support my thesis and which lie still in German archives, or in those of the Allied victors, and which have not been brought to light yet...

VI. Health Personnel

In the first years the hospital staff was incompetent. But little by little it acquired a great deal of practical experience. The head *Kapo* of the infirmary at Buchenwald was a printer by trade; his successor, Walter Kramer, was a strong and courageous person, a hard worker, and with a sense of organization. With time he became a remarkable specialist in wounds and operations. Through his position, the *Kapo* of the infirmary exercised, in all the camps, a considerable influence on overall living conditions. *So the prisoners [14] never put a specialist into that position, although it might have been possible in numerous camps, but rather a person who was completely devoted to the ruling clique in the camp.* When, for example, in November 1941, the *Kapo* Kramer and his closest collaborator Peix were shot by the S.S., the post of head of the infirmary did not go to a doctor, but was given, on the contrary, to a former Communist deputy to the *Reichstag*, Ernst Busse, who, with his assistant Otto Kipp from Dresden, concerned *himself with the purely administrative side [15]* of that service, whose activity never ceased growing, and played a large part in the greater stabilization of living conditions. A specialist put at the head of that service would, without any doubt, have brought catastrophe on the camp, because he never would have been able to dominate all the complicated and far-reaching intrigues, the outcome of which was very often fatal. (Page 135, emphasis added.)

One trembles at the thought that such a line of reasoning could have been advanced by Kogon, without batting an eye, and broadcast to the public, without rousing waves of indignant protest. To understand the full horror, it is important to know that in his turn the *Kapo* chose his assistants for reasons that had nothing to do with their competence as medical practitioners. And, to think that these so-called "leaders of the Prisoners," who exposed thousands of miserable men to various brutalities and who stole their food, had them treated, without being forced to do it by the S.S., by people who were absolutely incompetent.

The drama began at the entrance to the infirmary:

When the sick man finally got there, he first had to stand in line outside, no matter what the weather, and with his shoes cleaned. Since it was not possible to examine all the sick, and since there were always among them prisoners who only had the understandable desire to escape work, a *sturdy* doorman, a

prisoner, proceeded to make the first basic selection of the sick. (Page 130, emphasis added.)

The *Kapo*, chosen because he was a Communist, picked out a doorman, not because he was capable of telling the sick from the malingerers, or of distinguishing those who were more sick from those who were less, but because he was husky, and was able to give a good thrashing to anyone who tried to get past him without permission. It goes without saying that he was kept in good shape with extra food rations. The reasons for the choice of the nurses and the doctors, if not quite the same, were just as nobly inspired. When, finally, there were prisoners who were medical doctors in the camp infirmaries, it was because the S.S. insisted on it. I pass over the humiliations, even the retaliatory measures, which these doctors were made to suffer every time that the demands of their consciences came into conflict with the demands of politics and intrigue.

Eugen Kogon saw benefits in the procedure: *Kapo* Kramer had become "a remarkable specialist in wounds and operations," and he adds:

A good friend of mine, Willi Jellineck, was a pastry cook in Vienna At Buchenwald he was undertaker, a zero in the camp hierarchy. As a Jew, young, tall, and uncommonly strong, he had small chance of surviving during Koch's time. And yet, what did he become? Our best tuberculosis expert, a remarkable practitioner who helped many a comrade, and, in addition, was the bacteriologist of Block 50 ... (Page 324)

I am willing to disregard the use made of, and the fate of, the professional doctors whom the *Häftlingsführung* considered, individually and collectively, less useful than comrades Kramer and Jellineck. I am also willing to disregard the number of the dead who paid for the training and the remarkable expertise of the latter. But, if it can be conceded that these considerations are of negligible significance, then there is no reason for not extending this practice into the non-concentration camp world. In pursuit of this goal, one could issue two decrees at once: the first would disband all of the schools of medicine and replace them with training centers for pastry cooks and machinists, the second would dispatch to the kitchen or factory all of the doctors who are practicing, and would replace them with pastry cooks and machinists who are Communists or fellow-travelers. I do not doubt that the latter would emerge from such a reversal of roles in an honorable fashion; instead of blaming them for the deaths that they would cause, they would be credited for their adroitness in surviving all of the intrigues of political life. That is one way of looking at it.

VII. Devotion

From the beginning, the prisoners attached to the dental staff tried to help their comrades as much as possible. In all the dental centers they worked clandestinely, running great risks, and in a way hard to imagine. They made dentures, artificial parts, bridges, for those prisoners whose teeth had been broken by the S.S., or who had lost them because of the general conditions of life. (Page 131)

This statement is correct. But the "comrades" who were helped were always the same: a *Kapo*, a Block chief, a camp elder, a secretary, etc ... Those among the mass of prisoners who had lost their teeth for the reasons given above died without having recovered their loss with artificial teeth, or, if they survived, they had to wait for the liberation to be cared for. But, the clandestine nature of this work was very peculiar in view of the fact that it had the previous consent of the S.S.:

During the war, 1939-1940, they managed to set up a clandestine operation ward, thanks to the close collaboration of a series of *Kommandos*, and with the secret consent of the S.S. Doctor Blies... (Page 132)

The scope and the impact of this revelation can be appreciated when one realizes that the dental and medical installations in the camps were intended for the benefit of all of the prisoners in all of the camps and, that, thanks to the complicity of certain well placed S.S. personnel, these facilities were diverted to the sole benefit of the *Häftlingsführung*. In my opinion, if those who proceeded to misuse those facilities "ran great risks," that was only very just ... as seen from below.

Eugen Kogon himself feels the weakness of this reasoning:

In the last year, the internal administration of Buchenwald was so closely organized that the S.S. no longer had any say over certain very important internal matters. Tired, the S.S. was now accustomed to "let things go," and on the whole the politicals had a free hand... Most certainly it was always the directing clique, which identified itself more or less with the active anti-fascist forces, that most profited from the state of affairs: the mass of prisoners benefited only at times, and indirectly, mostly in that they no longer had to fear the intervention of the S.S., since those running the prisoners had taken steps on their own authority in the interests of all. (Page 284)

Obviously, it can be explained that if the S.S. "... let things go, and on the whole the politicals had a free hand," it was because the S.S. were "tired" or "accustomed to doing so." This is a way of looking at things. But, I am more persuaded to believe that this delegation of authority by the S.S. was due to the fact that the politicals had proven their devotion to the maintenance of order, on numerous occasions, and thus had established a "track record" from which the S.S. deduced that they could be trusted to assume a great deal of responsibility.

As for the "steps [taken] ... in the interest of all," they might have prevented the intervention of the S.S., but it was precisely this lack of intervention by the S.S. which gave a free hand to the *Häftlingsführung* a fact which, in turn, had a catastrophic effect on the mass of prisoners. It is better to be dealt with by God than by his saints. Furthermore if power becomes consolidated to the degree that it succeeds in neutralizing the possible opposition, reciprocally, it grows weaker from dissensions among those who share it. Looked at in this way, the S.S., by exercising a constant and meticulous control over everything that took place in the camp, would have substituted mistrust for an attitude of connivance in all of its relations with the *Häftlingsführung*. That the S.S. did not want that is easily understood. But, the *Häftlingsführung* did not want it either; this prisoner bureaucracy had deliberately crossed the Rubicon, and, although it might have shared the common lot with the

mass of the prisoners of the concentration camps, it preferred, whatever the rancor of the mass, to collaborate with the S.S. and to enjoy the benefits derived from such collaboration.

VIII. Cinema, sports

Once or twice per week, sometimes after quite long intervals, the cinema offered entertaining and documentary films. Given the frightful condition of life which prevailed in the camps, more than one comrade could not make up his mind to go to the cinema. (Page 128)

A strange thing, there was in the camps something that resembled sports. Yet the conditions of life did not lend themselves very well. There were, nevertheless, young men who thought they still had energy to expend, and they managed to get the authorization of the S.S. to play soccer. And, the weak who could just barely walk, those emaciated, exhausted men, half dead on their trembling legs, the starved, went with pleasure to this spectacle! (Page 124-125)

These weak, starved, half dead men who Eugen Kogon reports watched a game of soccer with pleasure, although *standing*, are the same who he thought, given the frightful conditions of existence, did not have the heart to go to a movie where one could *sit down*.

The truth is that the common prisoners did not go to the movies because every time that there was one, all of the seats were reserved by the *Häftlingsführung* people. It was different for soccer: the field was out in the open where everyone could see, and the surrounding grounds were big. Everyone could go. And, even so, some *Kapo* might take it into his head to break up the crowd of spectators and, with bludgeon in hand, chase all of those miserable men back toward the Blocks, on the pretext that they would profit more from their Sunday afternoon by resting!

As for the "young men who thought they still had energy to expend" and who made up the soccer teams, they were men of the *Häftlingsführung* or their protégés, who were stuffed with food that had been stolen from those who were watching them play; moreover, they did not have to work and were in good shape.

IX. The Brothel

The bordello was known by the modest title, *Sonderbau* [special house] For those who did not have connections high up, the length of visiting time was set at 20 minutes... The aim of the S.S. in this enterprise was to corrupt the politicals... The illegal management of the camp had given the order not to go there. On the whole, the politicals obeyed the order, so much so that the intentions of the S.S. were thwarted. (Pages 170-171)

Like the movie theater, the brothel was accessible only to the members of the *Häftlingsführung*, the only ones, in any case, who were in any state to find any use for it. No one complained about it, and there is not much point in any lengthy discussion about it. Nevertheless, I would like to point out that, according to Kogon "Some of the prisoners without morals, and among them a fairly large number of politicals, get themselves involved in frightful relations, after the arrival of the boys." (Page 236.) My view is that the politicals would have done better by using the brothel, since they were given the opportunity to do so. Kogon's praise for their refusal to use the brothel in order to avoid its "corrupting" influence becomes hollow when it appears that -- instead of normal sexual relations -- numerous politicals preferred the corruption of the young boys in the camp. I shall add that it was precisely to eliminate any excuse or any justification for this pederasty that the S.S. established brothels in all of the camps in the first place ...

X. Informing

The S.S. staff put spies in the camps in order to be informed about what was going on inside... The S.S. only got results with spies selected within the camp itself: common criminals, the asocial, and sometimes the political also .. (Page 276)

It was very rare for the *Gestapo* to pick out prisoners in the camps to be spies and informers... The *Gestapo* probably had such bad experiences with this sort of thing that fortunately it only resorted to it in very rare cases. (Page 255)

It seems quite surprising that a procedure which brought about results when it was used by the S.S. should come to nothing when used by the *Gestapo*. It is, nevertheless, a matter of fact that the *Gestapo* very rarely resorted to the use of informers in the camps; it did not need to. Everyone in the concentration camps who occupied any position of power was more or less an informer who reported directly, or through an intermediary, to the S.S. When the *Gestapo* wanted some information about someone in the camps, it only had to ask the S.S...

Looked at closely, the camps were all caught in the web of a gigantic network of informers. Among the mass of prisoners were the little men, the professional cheats, who kept the *Häftlingsführung* informed, out of congenital servility, for a bit of soup, a piece of bread, a stick of margarine, etc... or even unwittingly. Above these petty informers was the entire *Häftlingsführung* which spied on the mass for the S.S. when there was the need. Finally, the *Häftlingsführung* people informed on each other. Under these circumstances, denunciation often assumed strange aspects:

Wolf (former S.S. officer, homosexual, camp elder in 1942) began denouncing other comrades for the benefit of his Polish friends (he was the lover of a Pole). On one occasion he was crazy enough to make threats. He knew that a German Communist from Magdeburg was to be freed. When he told him that he knew how to keep him from being freed, by telling on him for political activity in the camp, he was answered that the S.S. would be informed of his pederasty. The quarrel *grew so bitter that the illegal direction of the camp*

forestalled action by the Fascist Poles by turning them over to the S.S. (Page 280, emphasis added.)

In other words, denunciation which was ignominious when it was done by the "greens," became a virtue, even a preventive measure, when it was done by the "reds." Happily, the "reds" could justify it by putting the label "Fascist" on the foreheads of their victims! And, this is a better example:

At Buchenwald in 1941, the most famous and most sinister case of voluntary[16] denunciation was that of the white Russian émigré, Grogorij Kushnir-Kushnarev who claimed to be a former Czarist general, and who, for months, won the confidence of various groups, then proceeded to deliver into the hands of the S.S. comrades of all kinds, especially the Russian prisoners. This agent of the *Gestapo*, responsible for the death of hundreds of prisoners, also dared to denounce, in the most infamous way, [17] all those with whom he had any conflict, even for minor reasons... For a long time it was not possible to catch him alone, to kill him, because the S.S. watched over him very carefully. Finally they made him the director, in fact, of the secretariat of the prisoners. Once in that position he was not satisfied just to bring about the downfall of all those who failed to please him, he clogged the wheels of the prisoners' autonomous organization. Finally, at the beginning of 1942, he felt sick and was stupid enough to go to the infirmary. Thus, he put himself in the hands of his enemies. With the authorization of S.S. *Doctor Hoven, who had long been mixed-up in this affair, and was on the side of the politicals*, Kushnir was at once declared to be contagious, he was isolated, and a few hours later he was killed with an injection of poison. (Page 276, emphasis added.)

This Grogorij Kushnir-Kushnarev was probably guilty of all that he was accused of, but everyone who climbed the ladder in the hierarchy of power in the concentration camps and who occupied the same position, before or after him, behaved in the same way, and their consciences are charged with the same crimes. The only difference in the case of Mr. Kushnir-Kushnarev was the fact that he did not have Eugen Kogon's approval... In any case, it is difficult to believe that the S.S., in the person of the S.S. Doctor Hoven, gratuitously took so active a part in his elimination.

Eugen Kogon adds: "I still remember the sigh of *relief that went through the camp*, when like lightning the news went around that Kushnir had died in the infirmary." (Page 276, emphasis added.) The members of the clique that Kogon belonged to doubtless sighed with relief, and that fact is understandable since Kushnir's death meant the assumption of more power. But, the sigh was only one of hope in the rest of the camp, since a death by execution of no matter what influential member of the *Häftlingsführung* was always greeted with some hope of finally seeing the common lot improved. After a short time, it was evident that nothing had changed, and, until the next execution, it was a matter of indifference to everyone whether they were sacrificed on the altar of truth or of lies.

XI. Transports

It is known that in the camps the office of labor statistics, composed of prisoners, directed the use of manpower, subject to the instruction of the head of the labor force, and the labor office. As the years went on, the S.S. was overwhelmed with enormous demands. At Buchenwald, S.S.

Hauptsturmführer Schwartz tried only once himself to make up a transport of a thousand prisoners. After having kept almost the entire camp on the grounds for half a day, to review the men, he managed to collect 600 men. But those who had been examined and selected out, slipped away in all directions, and not one remained in Schwartz's hands... (Page 286)

In my opinion, there was no drawback in having Schwartz's experience repeated every time that the organization of a transport to some work area was attempted; if the S.S. had never succeeded, all the better. But, unfortunately, "from that moment, the head of the labor force turned over to the prisoners in the labor statistic bureau all questions of the distribution of labor." (*Ibid.*) And, once that happened, it was no longer possible "to slip away in all directions" after the work force had been assembled on the mustering grounds, as had been the case with Schwartz. With rubber truncheons in hand, all of the *Kapos*, all of the Block Chiefs, all of the *Lagerschutz* (prisoner police), as well as others, set up a menacing barrier to any attempted flight. Compared with them, *Hauptsturmführer* Schwartz seemed innocuous. The *Häftlingsführung* people were Communists, anti-Fascist, and anti-Hitler, among other things, but, they could not bear to have anyone disturb the Hitlerian order of things or to weaken the war effort of the Third Reich by trying to escape from it. As compensation for their service to the *Führer*, they were given power to designate those prisoners who would make up a transport, and they exercised their power with a zeal beyond all praise.

XII. Tableau

One result of "power gained through corruption" was the enrichment of one or several men at the expense of the others. Sometimes this reached shameful proportions in the camps, even in those where the politicals were in power. More than one who took advantage of his position lived the life of a prince, while his comrades died by the hundreds. When the cartons of food for the camp, containing fats, sausages, jams, flour, and sugar, were smuggled outside the camp by S.S. accomplices, to be sent to the families of the prisoners in question, one can hardly say it was justified. But most exasperating was when, at a time when the local S.S. were no longer wearing high boots but only regular army shoes, the members of the small clique of "*caids*" walked proudly around in stylish clothes, custom tailored, like dandies, some of them even with a little dog on a leash! That is a chaos of misery, filth, disease, famine and death! In this case, the "instinct for self-preservation" was carried beyond all reasonable limits and ended in a phariseism, ridiculous to be sure, but hard as rock, badly out of tune with the social and political ideals proclaimed at the same time by these persons. (Page 287)

It was like that in all of the camps. And, with certain reservations, the reason for the horror could hardly be better described, or in fewer words: the instinct for self-preservation.

If one can end the commentary on this *tableau*, with the preceding observation, therein also lies the basis for pointing out that the instinct for self-preservation, an ancient conception, is quite another thing altogether from that taught by a puerile moral. From the fierce Guitton, besieged at La Rochelle by Richelieu, who had himself bled in order to feed his son on his cooked blood, to Saturn who devoured his children at birth to escape the death which the Titan threatened, self-preservation is susceptible to the most varied human reactions. In a culture which promotes the value of human life, one might think that there are more Guittons than Saturns. And, under normal conditions, the conduct of the majority of individuals would not allow one to affirm the contrary. But, this behavior is only part of the veneer of civilization, and one has only to scrape it a little -- i.e., to change brutally the social conditions -- in order to show what price human nature attaches to human life.

In the voices of all of the children of France, the good sense of the people cries out and echoes *Il était un petit navire...* (There was a little ship...) and consoles itself, insofar as it believes, that it lessens the horror of the situation, by affirming that in order to find out who will be eaten, *On tira à la courte paille* (we will draw straws), rather than to leave the decision to a democratic majority. But, public opinion was not less indignant when it learned that that little ship had become the airplane of the Italian General Nobile, which had crash landed on the polar ice, and that the General could be said to have survived, until the arrival of the rescue expedition, only because he had eaten one or more of his comrades. If public opinion does not react violently against the self-serving accounts of the concentration camps by former *Häftlingsführung* people, it is because the fact is not clearly made that the concentration camp bureaucracy -- using every method of corruption, keeping for itself all of the straws, and having the drawing done by the S.S. -- did "eat" the mass of the prisoners.

Before the 1939 war, I myself knew many people who "preferred to die on their feet than to live on their knees." Without doubt, they were sincere, but in the camps they lived prostrated in order to insure their survival. After returning to civilian life -- or simply to life -- they are still just as uncompromising about this precept, unaware of the defeat that they suffered. They keep making the same speeches, and now they are ready to collaborate with the Communists like they did with the Nazis.

In reality, one sees very clearly that except for the instinct for self-preservation which played a role at all levels (e.g., the ordinary prisoner in the face of the *Häftlingsführung*, the *Häftlingsführung* in the face of the S.S., and even the S.S. staff in the face of its superiors), there is no valid explanation for what went on in the concentration camp world. The instinct for self-preservation is very obvious, but one does not want to admit it. So one turns to psychoanalysis: Molière's doctors talked to their patients in Latin, which they knew no more about than they did about their profession, and the public meekly approved.

XIII. Evaluations

The happenings in the concentration camps were psychologically very singular, as much for the S.S. as for the inmates. In general, the reactions of the prisoners seemed more comprehensible than those of their oppressors. Actually the first were of a more human kind, while the others were markedly inhuman. (Page 305)

In my view, it would be more correct to say that the reactions of both groups were all of the human kind, in the psychological sense of the word, and that with regard to the *Häftlingsführung*, especially, and to the S.S., they were all markedly inhuman in the moral sense.

Further on, Eugen Kogon points out:

Those who were the least affected in the camps were the asocial and the professional criminals. The reason is to be found in the parallel between their psychic and social makeup and that of the S.S. (Page 320)

Perhaps, this may be a correct analysis. But, it must also be agreed that the concentration camps were not the place to cultivate a political consciousness in the common criminals. On the other hand, the camps did provide the appropriate atmosphere for turning the political prisoners into rogues. This phenomenon is hardly unique to the concentration camps. It can be observed constantly in all of the reformatories and in all of the prisons in every nation of the world, where men are perverted on the pretext that they are being rehabilitated.

Dr. Sigmund Freud's theory of repression explains all of this very well, and it would be childish to dwell on the point. In all of the penal institutions, the mentality of the whole group, as a result of systematic restraint, shapes itself at the lowest level, usually typified by the guard, the link between all of the prisoners. This fact should not be surprising. The social environment in which we live, in which the idea of the concentration camp is rejected with so much righteous indignation, but in which, at the same time, it is carried out to various degrees, has given the political, turned scoundrel, the right -- momentarily, I hope -- to play the hero!

It is, without doubt, because he anticipated some reproach for this kind of thinking that Eugen Kogon wrote in his Foreword:

It was a world in itself, a State in itself, a lawless condition into which was thrown a human being, who from that moment on, turning to his advantage the virtues and vices -- more vices than virtues! -- ceased struggling except to save his miserable existence. Did he struggle against the S.S.? Certainly not! He had to struggle as much, if not more, against his companions in captivity...
[18]

Tens of thousands of survivors made to suffer more, perhaps, by the reign of terror of arrogant companions in captivity than by the infamies of the S.S., will thank me for having also shed light on this other aspect of the camps, for not having feared to unveil the role played in the various camps by certain

political types, who, today, make a big noise over their uncompromising anti-Fascism. I know that some of my comrades have despaired at seeing the injustice and brutality dressed up with an aureole of heroism by good people who suspected nothing. Such profiteers of the camps will not emerge enhanced in my study: it provides grounds to dim these usurped glories. What camp were you in? What *Kommando*? What job did you do? What color did you wear? What party did you belong to? etc... (Page 17)

One can only say that the witness has not kept his promise: one looks in vain, throughout the whole "report" for the condemnation of anyone who was distinctly a political. On the other hand, from the beginning to the end, he pleads for the Communist group, either indirectly or expressly:

That elastic wall erected against the S.S..... It was the German Communists who furnished the best means to realize that task... The anti-Fascist elements, that is, first and foremost the Communists... (Page 286)

There are almost countless other examples where he defends the Communists or the *Häftlingsführung*. Actually by defending the Communists, he was also defending the bureaucracy of the concentration camps, because only those who called themselves Communists could claim to get into it and, once in it, stay there. To a certain extent Kogon is making a plea for himself, and I very much fear that, after even the least informed reader has finished reading the book, he will feel an irresistible urge to ask Kogon the very question that he suggests: what positions did you hold?

The conclusion of all this? Here is what Kogon gives us: "Accounts about the concentration camps usually evoke, at the most, astonishment or a shaking of the head; they hardly ever touch the comprehension, and in no case, do they wring hearts." (Page 347) Clearly, this is true, but whose fault is it? In the intoxication of the liberation, and in giving vent to a resentment pent-up during the long years of the occupation, the French public opinion believed everything. However, as social relations became progressively more normal, it became more and more difficult to influence it. Today, accounts of the concentration camps seem to everyone more like justifications than testimonies. The public now wonders how it got itself caught in the trap, and for two cents it would put everyone on the defendants' bench.

XIV. Statistics

In 1945, when Kogon's book was published in Germany, there was still not enough data at hand to allow one to say with accuracy how many persons of all nationalities had been imprisoned by the Germans in the concentration camps. Eugen Kogon acknowledges this and warns that the figures he was able to get are only approximate:

Without the slightest doubt, thousands of persons went through the camps during the twelve years of the National-Socialist regime. If we take as a basis for an estimate the number of dead at Auschwitz, which alone seems to come to between three and a half million, as well as the number of dead in the other

camps of that kind, it is easy to see that the total number of interned came to at least eight or ten million. (Page 34)

Then, going into detail (Page 147), he produces precise statistics for this period; the total for all the camps and for the sum of the deportees, racial or not, is the following:

Total number of prisoners: 8,000,000

Survivors: 500,000

Total number of dead: 7,500,000

This figure of 7,500,000 means that about 94 percent of the total number of prisoners died in the camps. But, if the rest of his statistics are studied carefully, we see: (1) that the number of non-racial deportees comes to 606,000, up to 1939 (Germans only), and to 3,538,000 from 1939 to 1945, for a total of 4,144,000; and (2) that Kogon does not give the total number of racial deportees, but only that of those deportees who died, or the sum of 5,620,000. These two sums add up to 9,764,000 deportees. The margin of approximation is therefore quite broad: about 2,000,000. But, Kogon warned us of that fact. (Page 34)

On the other hand, if we take into consideration the non-racial deportees, the figures show that out of a total of 4,144,000 deportees, about 1,827,000 are estimated to have died, leaving 2,317,000 survivors, about 56 percent of the overall total. Conversely, the number of dead amounted to about 44 percent. Naturally, in the press, it was the manifestly false figure of 94 percent that served to illustrate the horror, or some very similar percentage that had been pulled out of thin air; in France, it was usually 82 percent, and I have never learned just how the statisticians arrived at that figure.

What puzzled me most of all at the time was the total number of deportees: 9,764,000-or even only 8,000,000. For the Germans to have deported that number of persons during a twenty-seven month period (March 1942 to August 1944) (19), it would have called for transportation facilities which, from the facts, the Germans in the midst of war did not have at their disposal. The magnitude of such an operation can be seen upon reflection: three to four hundred thousand persons per month, or ten to thirteen thousand per day, needed to be transported without fail. To do this would have required a minimum of six to nine trains a day, assuming that each train could transport about fifteen hundred persons (plus the accompanying guards and their equipment), as was the case for those trains that left from France. If Kogon is correct, that was quite a lot of rolling stock to divert from the German war effort. Although I am not a railway expert, I made some calculations that were based upon the duration of these trips by train. The deportees from the West, like those from the East, all said that their trips had lasted from four to six days, which would mean, taking five days as the average, that for the entire period of the deportation, there were between sixty to ninety trains, constantly, day and night, going back and forth at this job. When spare equipment is added into the picture, the amount of necessary rolling stock would include between eighty to a hundred locomotives and between three to four thousand railway cars. And, I did not estimate the huge number of personnel, both railway workers and guards, that would have been required.

After the appearance of Kogon's book, other means of estimating the number of deportees appeared. For example, at Nuremberg, the Attorney General Charles Dubost, representing France, stated on January 29, 1946:

The census taking which we have carried out in France allows it to be affirmed that there were more than 250,000 deportees from France: only 35,000 have returned. Document F. 497, filed under the number R.F. 339. indicates that, out of the 600,000 arrests made by the Germans in France, 350,000 were made with internment in France or in Germany in mind. Total number of deportees: 250,000. Number of deportees returned: 35,000. (IMT, VI. p. 338)

The percentage of survivors, was, therefore, 14 percent and the percentage of the dead was 86 percent. But, to a question put to him by the Minister for Veterans and War Victims of the French Government, Dubost answered, through the official journal, *Débats parlementaires*, on February 24, 1962, in this way:

According to statistical information released on the first of December 1961 in the multi-copy card file of the deportees and internees of the 1939-1945 war, kept by the National

Institute of Statistics and Economic Studies, the number of cards given out to deportees and internees, or to their beneficiaries, is as follows:

Living Deceased

Deportees (Resistants) 16,702 9,783

Deportees (Politicals) 13,415 9,235

Internees (Resistants) 9,911 5,759

Internees (Politicals) 10,117 2,130

TOTALS 50,145 26,907

From Dubost's figures, it can be seen that the total number of deportees was 49,135 and that the total number of dead was 19,018. This means that about 38 percent of the deportees died while 62 percent (or 30,117) survived. Obviously, it is difficult to determine from these figures the exact number of survivors and of dead that existed during the month of May 1945. Returning from the camps, even after having spent only short periods of time there, the survivors were a very frail lot whose annual mortality rate was understandably way above normal. Consequently, I would not be surprised to be told that out of the 19,108 who were dead on February 24, 1962, 35 to 45 percent died after their return to France. In that case, one would have to concede

that on May 8, 1945, the proportions of living to dead were the following: 75 to 80 percent were survivors and 20 to 25 percent were dead. While tragic enough, this latter estimate is quite a different thing from 86 percent dead and 14 percent living as deduced from the figures that were brought forth at Nuremberg by the Attorney General Dubost; in fact, this estimate is so different that it almost represents inverse proportions!

What supports my opinion that these proportions, which I have noted for France, are valid for all of the camps, is my detailed study of the statistics of the Buchenwald camp, where I was deported myself. As a result of my study, I came to the following conclusions: to Buchenwald and its satellite camps there seem to have been deported, from 1939 to 1945, a total of 238,980 persons, of whom statistics show that 56,545 died or 23 percent. But, I cannot vouch for this rate of 23 percent, for the following reasons: the incoming prisoners were registered just once, while the outgoing, being dead, were often subject to double registration, the first time in the satellite camp in which they died (Dora, for example) and a second time at Buchenwald, where, until the time that each of the satellite camps was equipped with a crematorium, they were cremated. In the statistics that were produced, those who died in the camps like Halberstadt, Ellrich, Beuchow, and Dora, among others, were, in fact, added to the number of persons who were cremated at Buchenwald. The mortality rate might, then, have been a little less, but not much; even 20 percent for example, would still be enormous. The Assistant Bishop of Munich, Mgr. Neuhaussler, did the same sort of research that I did, but concerning the Dachau camp where he was interned. For Dachau he came to the same conclusions as I did for Buchenwald: there were between 199,519 and 206,206 internees (the uncertainty arises from the fact that there were two numbering systems on the camp register) of whom 67,665 died, or 28 percent. The same observation applies for Dachau as for Buchenwald with regard to the adding of the dead in the satellite camps to those of the central camp. Still, it must be noted here that the card index of the S.S. camp staff showed only about 26,000 dead, according to Mgr. Neuhaussler, in his book *So war es in Dachau*. But, Pastor Niemöller claimed, in a speech given on July 3, 1946, and published with the title *Der Weg ins Freie* by Franz M. Helbach at Stuttgart, that "238,756 were cremated at Dachau," or a greater number than there were internees. On a visit to Dachau in 1945, I was able to take a photograph of a sign that had been put up between two trees at the entrance of the camp; the inscription on the sign read as follows: "This area is being retained as a shrine to the 238,000 individuals who were cremated here." Without a doubt, this sign which had been prepared for the benefit of the tourists was based on the conclusions of Pastor Niemöller who was interned in that camp, and who then became its authority.

I must add that since he published *So war es in Dachau* in 1969, Mgr. Neuhaussler has made new discoveries which have caused him to modify his first conclusions and that he had the honesty to make them public, on March 16, 1962, in a speech that he gave at Dachau to the representatives of some 15 nations that had gathered there to commemorate the liberation of the camp. *Le Figaro* of March 17, 1962, reported the statistical data that was contained in that talk as follows:

This afternoon in bitter cold and in spite of a snow storm, pilgrims gathered together at Dachau camp where thirty thousand men were exterminated, out of

the two hundred thousand from thirty-eight countries who were interned there from 1933 to 1945.

Moreover, all of the other newspapers of the day printed the same figures. So it was 30,000 deportees who were cremated at Dachau (or 13 percent, which is still enough), and not 67,665, which was the number that Mgr. Neuhaussler had calculated initially. In other words, the card index that had been maintained by the S.S. staff reflected the truth, but very good care has been taken not to take it into consideration. It is possible that some day similar figures will be determined for Buchenwald.

Such is the extent of the exaggerations which no one doubted in 1950, which Mr. Eugen Kogon did not hesitate to authenticate and to disseminate, and which the world press still echoes on a daily basis in spite of all of the new information that has come to light. Moreover, in France, no commemoration of war events takes place that does not loudly reaffirm that 250,000 French nationals were deported to Germany, that only 35,000 came back, and that six million Jews were exterminated in the gas chambers.

Concerning the Jews, Kogon gives the number of dead as 5,620,000, as we have seen. In the camps where the Jews were interned, the mortality rate -- while far from the percentages that have been published by the press for propaganda purposes -- was certainly as high as that suffered by other prisoners. Although we do not yet have reliable documents concerning these camps, we shall see in the following chapters what one may think, both of the means that were used allegedly to exterminate the Jews and the number of alleged Jewish victims.

XV. Nota bene...

There are a number of the most unlikely tales, as well as certain examples of journalistic sensationalism, that I must point out before I finish with Mr. Kogon.

Among the unlikely tales must be included most of Kogon's statements concerning the listening to foreign broadcasts. I sincerely doubt that it was possible for anyone to set up and to use a secret radio receiver inside any of the concentration camps. If the Voice of America, the B.B.C. or Radio Free France were occasionally heard in the camp, it was with the consent of the S.S.; moreover, only a very small number of privileged prisoners could have been among the listeners, and, then, mainly by chance. Thus it happened to me personally at Dora during the short period that I served as the *Schwung* (orderly) for the Oberscharführer who commanded the *Hundesstafel* (the company of guard dogs).

My work consisted in cleaning a whole barrack which housed the more or less ranking members of the S.S. staff; among other things, I waxed their boots, made their beds, cleaned their mess kits, etc....all things that I did most humbly and conscientiously. In everyone of the rooms in this barrack was a radio. For all of the gold in the world, I would not have taken the risk of listening to one, even when I was absolutely certain of being alone. However, at about eight o'clock in the morning, when all of his subordinates had left for work, it happened two or three times that the

Oberscharführer called me into his room, where he had tuned to the B.B.C. that was broadcasting in French, and asked me to translate for him, which I did under my breath.

In the evening, back in my Block, I passed on the news in a whisper to my friends Delarbre (from Belfort) and Gourguet (from the Creusot) urging them either to keep it to themselves or to repeat it only to comrades of whom they were very sure, and even then to do so in such a way so that it could not be traced to its source.

We did not constitute a "committee," and not one of us claimed that we were in touch with the Allies. Moreover, nothing happened to us. But during that same time, there was a stir that centered around the listening to foreign broadcasts in which, I believe, Debeaumarche was mixed up. I never knew exactly what it was all about. One of the members of that group approached me one day saying that there was a secret listening post in the camp, that a political movement was getting orders from the English, etc.... He backed up what he was saying by telling me the news that I had listened to that very morning, or the evening, before, with the *Oberscharführer*. I expressed my skepticism in such terms that thereafter he considered me someone to be avoided. It was just as well for me. A few days later, there were massive arrests in the camp, and among those arrested were the fellow who I just mentioned and Debeaumarche himself. The to-do ended with a few hangings. In all likelihood, it began with a prisoner in my situation who had talked too much, and what he had said was imprudently bruited about, until it reached the *Sicherheitsdienst* (S.S. secret police) through an informer in the *Häftlingsführung*.

When Eugen Kogon writes:

I spent many a night, with a very few who were in on it, before a 5-tube receiver which I had taken from the S.S. Doctor Ding-Schuller to have it repaired in the camp. I listened to the Voice of America in Europe as well as to the *Soldatsender*, and I copied down the important news. (Page 283)

I am willing to believe that he may have listened to foreign broadcasts; but I am inclined to think that he listened to the broadcasts in question in the company of Doctor Ding-Schuller. As for all of the rest, it is only an embellishment which is intended both to make believable the revolutionary activity on the part of those in the *Häftlingsführung*, and to better excuse their monstrous exactions.

I believe that Kogon listened to these broadcasts in the company of his S.S. patron Doctor Ding-Schuller, or at least with his connivance and consent, because Dr. Francois Bayle reports in his *Croix Gammée contre Caducée* this curious testimony that was given by Kogon at Nuremberg: Doctor Ding-Schuller asked him to take care of his wife and children in case Germany was defeated! From this testimony, I gather that their relations were surely more cordial than Kogon has admitted. And. I shall add that if this request implies a *quid pro quo* which Kogon would not admit in any case! -- the privileged position of this singular prisoner would be explained by a mutual collaborative understanding whose inspiration and aims would appear to be much less noble than it has so far been convenient to concede.

Further speculation along these lines is not likely to be productive, nevertheless, the record may reflect that the collaboration between Kogon and the S.S. was, by his own admission, profitable, friendly, and often intimate. There was also the collaboration between Kogon and the Communists, as has been mentioned in earlier sections of this chapter.

As for Kogon's journalistic sensationalism, I quote the following example which should provide the reader with an idea of what I mean:

Let us recall the taking of oath of those aspiring to the S.S., at midnight, in the cathedral at Braunschweig. There, before the bones of Henry the First, the only German emperor on whom he set any value, Himmler was fond of expatiating on the mystique of the "*Communauté de conjurés*." Then, after that, *in the gay sunshine he would go to some concentration camp in order to watch the political prisoners being whipped [20] one after the other.* (Page 24, emphasis added.)

Mme Koch who previously had been stenographer in a cigarette factory sometimes *took baths* in a tub filled with madeira. (Page 266, emphasis added.)

Statements of this sort abound concerning all of the important personages of the Nazi regime, and they produce pleasant sadistic reactions. They also exhibit some of that same state of mind that made *Le Rire* publish, in September 1914, a photograph of the child with his hands cut off or *Le Matin* describe, on the 15th of April 1916, the Emperor William II as being a paranoiac with cancer, with at the most just a few more months to live, when, in fact, he had neither of those afflictions. Furthermore, the state of mind seems to have caused Henri Desgranges in *L'Auto*, in September 1939, to "thumb his nose" at a Göring and say that the *Reichsmarschall* was without soft soap with which to wash himself. The banality of the method is equaled only by the credulity of the public and by the imperturbability of those who make use of it and keep repeating it about all enemies in all wars.

FOOTNOTES

1. *La Jeune Parque*, November 1947. It was published in Germany in 1945 under the title: *Der S.S. Staat*.

2. During this time, for example, a Doctor Seguin never succeeded in getting himself recognized in his professional capacity by the *Häftlingsführung*. Having never been acknowledged as a medical doctor by the Communists, they sent him to work in the quarry where he died.

3. It seems that the National Socialists took him over from the Weimar Republic. This fact is not without its humor because it shows that the jailing of Communist troublemakers was a policy which was common to both regimes.

4. He does not seem to have encountered a Martin-Chauffier.

5. The "disposal" of "troublesome" prisoners by the *Häftlingsführung* was often done for reasons much more base than those that are mentioned by Kogon. For example, those prisoners who got in the way of the ruling clique or those who might possibly get in the way by being placed in influential positions by the S.S. were often marked for death. The argument of collaboration is, moreover, worthless; this "illegal management" -- i.e., the *Häftlingsführung* -- collaborated openly with the S.S., as is shown elsewhere in this book.

6. Eugen Kogon sometimes uses the word "illegal" and sometimes the word "clandestine" to describe the operation of the *Häftlingsführung*. Actually, there was nothing the least illegal or clandestine about it inasmuch as it had been set up by the S.S.

7. There were many Communists who were not "accredited", and they were, above all, decent people. They were lost in the mass and shared the common lot.

8. It is well to note that the S.S. generally did not steal from the prisoners. First of all, they enjoyed better rations to begin with and, thus, had no pressing need to obtain more. Secondly, when they did desire to supplement their rations, they let other prisoners do the stealing for them and were thus better served.

9. These quotation marks appear in the original text.

10. I want to emphasize the word "possible."

11. Osterloh was a "green," and that is why the incident is described as having been a "good example."

12. Emphasis added.

13. The *Bunker* was the prison within the camp. If Kogon is to be believed, "it was not the S.S. but the first elder of the camp, Richter, who invented it," (p. 174) when the S.S. had not even thought of it.

14. This is an improper generalization. It was a question only of those who had made themselves their leaders, thanks to the authority that they derived from the S.S.

15. All of the Buchenwald prisoners can testify that his main concern was for the actual delivery of health and medical services to the prisoners.

16. Since this way of thinking doubtless admits a denunciation ... involuntary! As we see, ways to get out of things are not lacking!

17. It seems that there are other ways of denouncing which are less infamous or which are not infamous at all, evidently!

18. This statement is an improper generalization. As a common prisoner, one had to struggle against those who exercised power on behalf of the S.S., while distrusting his fellow prisoners among the common lot.

19. This twenty-seven month period is generally recognized as being the time period during which the vast majority of the foreign internees who were incarcerated in the German concentration camp system were deported by the Germans from whatever locale in which they had been arrested.

20. If the rack at Buchenwald (if, indeed, there was one) was hidden from the Chief of Police of Weimar during his inspection of the camp, it is hardly likely that it would be shown to his superior *Reichsführer*-S.S. Himmler.

Part III The Drama of European Jews

Chapter Twelve

Raul Hilberg: His Doctrine and His Methods

Between the *Commentaries on the Holy Scriptures* of Saint Thomas Aquinas (1225-1274) and *The Destruction of the European Jews*, (Chicago, Quadrangle, 1961) an exhaustive commentary on the Nuremberg documents by Mr. Raul Hilberg, there is plainly no common measure. Indeed, one can feel assured that in seven centuries the latter will not be spoken of at all, or, if it is still mentioned, it will only be mentioned in reference to something unworthy of notice except as an example of the most scandalous aberrations of our times. Now, after seven centuries, when Saint Thomas Aquinas is spoken of it is to point him out as having been the originator of a philosophy also aberrant, which from the 17th century on was called *ancilla theologiae*, by the Humanists and the Free-thinkers. Nevertheless, this philosophy was that of centuries of faith. It was substantial; it opened windows onto a world which was the dream of the epoch; and, thus, it deserved to become that Thomism to which reference must be made today, if the broad currents of contemporary philosophy are to be correctly explained. To construct his system, the man had, of course, to mutilate Aristotle; but in the 13th century printing had not yet been discovered, manuscripts were scarce, and the means of research at the disposal of intellectuals were so rudimentary that he was the only one who knew it. Then, three centuries later, having discovered the trickery, the Humanists and the Free-thinkers spoke of *ancilla theologiae*. But there was no scandal. The fraud was attributed to an imperfect acquaintance with the writings of Aristotle. Today, more light has been shed on the matter, and Thomism has a place. But, there will never be any *Hilbergism*. And if the 790 large size pages, based on almost 1,400 documentary references, of *The Destruction of the European Jews*, some day are found to be the *ancilla* of something, it will only be of a not very nobly inspired purpose. Therein lies the difference, and it is not a small one.

Having admitted that neither in their persons nor in the value and influence of their respective works are the two men comparable, if thought of, Saint Thomas Aquinas nevertheless came to mind after having read Mr. Raul Hilberg, there were good reasons. The most important reason of all is this one, which is the central theme of this chapter: the Nuremberg documents that Mr. Raul Hilberg used to prove to us that 5,100,000 (p. 767) or 5, 407,500 (p. 670) Jews were exterminated by the Germans during the Second World War -- 1,000,000 in the gas chambers at Auschwitz, 950,000 in five other camps much less well equipped, 1,400,000 (if I have understood correctly his complicated and often contradictory calculations) by *Einsatzgruppen*, and the rest, either 1,750,000 on page 767, or 2,069,500 on page 670, in camps and in

ways which could be called pottering compared to the others -- are of the same kind and the same worth as those in which Saint Thomas Aquinas, like all the Church Fathers before him, found the proof that the first act in the creation of the world, the separation of light from darkness, took place exactly 4,001 years before the birth of Christ, that Joshua had stopped the sun in its course, that Jonas sojourned in the belly of a whale, etc.

And, then there is the problem of misuse. Mr. Raul Hilberg in making the documents say what they do not say, except after having been removed from their context and rewritten, is an example on a small scale of what Saint Thomas Aquinas did on a large scale in giving to the writings of Aristotle that interpretation which oriented the entire intellectual work of the Middle Ages in Europe to the celebrated formula, *Aristoteles dixit*, when Aristotle had, in fact, not said it. In this respect, they both, each at about the same distance in time, illustrate that moral which was quite well defined by Saint Ignatius Loyola, according to which, since the end justifies the means, all means are good to justify the end. But here again, to permit a fair appreciation of both, the coordinates of the point which they have in common must be given. Saint Thomas Aquinas found himself in the presence of the writings of Aristotle, which at that time were spread about Europe with so much success by Jewish rabbis and Arab clerks that they were threatening to unsettle Christian thought, and for him it was a purely philosophic problem. But, in the case of Mr. Raul Hilberg, it is a question of justifying by a proportional number of cadavers the enormous subsidies which Germany has paid annually since the end of the war, and which she continues to pay, to the State of Israel as reparations for a wrong which she did not do to Israel, either morally or legally, since at the time these wrongs for which she is charged were taking place, the State of Israel did not exist. In short, it is only, purely and very basely, a material problem.

Here I would like to point out -- in order to underline the extent of this swindle, which has no other name in any language -- that the State of Israel was not founded until May 1948 and that the Jewish victims of the Nazis were the nationals of various states but not of Israel. Nevertheless, Germany pays to Israel sums calculated on the basis of about 6,000,000 dead. In addition, since at least four-fifths of these 6,000,000 were very much alive at the end of the war and countable, she pays to those still living in the other countries of the world, aside from Israel, and to the beneficiaries of those who have since died, substantial reparations as victims of Nazism. This means that for the enormous majority, she is paying twice.

All of these indemnities that are so generously granted to the Jews seem, moreover, to have made the gypsies desire to cash in on this "bonanza" in a manner similar to that of the State of Israel and Zionism. If *Le Monde* of December 29, 1961, is to be believed, the gypsies have now given themselves a king with the name of H. M. Vaida Voievod III, who claims to be the "Supreme and spiritual head of the gypsy people" and who expects to obtain from the United Nations a corner in the world, where the great wandering of their caravans will come to an end, just as, theoretically, the State of Israel was to end the *Diaspora*. When he is asked what corner of the world he lays claim to and where it is, he answers that it is Romanestan, and he places it, now on a Pacific Island, now in a country near Israel. Furthermore, he specified that the number of his subjects strolling along all the roads of Europe add up to 12 million, and that the reason there are not more is that between 1939 and 1945 the Nazis exterminated

three and a half million. Unfortunately, for him, in this case, there are statistics to put the number of gypsy victims of Nazism between 300 and 350,000 only, which is, of course, quite atrocious enough. Things have not come to a point where one can be accused of anti-Romanestanism as easily as one can be accused of anti-Semitism, every time the fantastic statistics of the *Center of Contemporary Jewish Documentation* are mentioned, and one does not run the risk of being accused of the same low intent if one speaks of the 3,500,000 Nazi victims of H. M. Vaida Voievod III in a humorous tone. If, then, the U. N., let us say, should grant the gypsies the right to regroup in this Romanestan, which only needs to have its geographical location determined, Germany will have no choice but to subsidize them. Having granted the State of Israel an appreciable and substantial indemnity for the victims of Nazism among the Jewish people, it would be difficult to refuse the same to Romanestan, whose claims the U. N. could not fail to support as they did those of the State of Israel. Then the 3,500,000 gypsies exterminated by the Nazis would dispute the 6,000,000 Jews for the limelight in the world press. But, the Reverend Father Fleury, Chaplain of the gypsies of France, already warns that H.M. Vaida Voievod III is only an impostor, and many agree with him. It must be acknowledged that the number of people is much smaller who have the same opinion of the leaders of the State of Israel and their supporters, whose policy, while in every point similar, and just as poorly grounded, has nevertheless succeeded. To the extent that it has shown post-war Zionism to be very closely related to what can be called Romanestanism, the burlesque story of the hero of this adventure deserved to be cited here, if only to give the reader as exact an idea as possible of the worth of the work to which Mr. Raul Hilberg has devoted himself.

But I would like to return to the problem of misuse, and on this subject to be well understood. Having spent an appreciable number of months in the horrible physical and moral conditions of a concentration camp, I know what I am talking about. What I am discussing is only the degree of the horror, since the truth -- without further exaggeration -- is quite enough. The fact that some poor uneducated devil of a fellow like the cure and the other witness to whom I have referred elsewhere tell us that they have seen, the one, thousands enter the gas chambers in the camp where we were interned together and where there were none, and the other, the heads of human beings buried up to their necks, crushed by the wheels of barrows pushed by the prisoners on order of the SS, is understandable. They are victims who are fired by a resentment in proportion to what they suffered, and the guilty one is the judge who believed them. That a general of an *Einsatzgruppe*, testifying under threat of death, tells what he thinks will be most likely to save his life, and that Höss, a former commandant of Auschwitz, does the same, like many others, is easily understood and calls for no explanation. The fact that in order to get into the good graces of his captors, some poor SS private, attached to an *Einsatzgruppe*, reports that his unit exterminated "thousands" or "tens of thousands of Jews," as is seen in the documents cited by Mr. Raul Hilberg, is not at all astonishing. Nor, is it strange that a Martin-Chauffier, guilty of many things, tries to have them forgiven by howling with the wolves and that a David Rousset, whose main concern in the camp was to obtain the protection of the communists, and a Eugen Kogon, who had no other concern than to establish as comfortable a balance as possible between the SS and the communists, have recounted what they did. The background and motivation of the witness is an important factor when considering the amount of weight that should be given to his testimony. And, it is the business of the judge and of the specialists in the human

sciences to establish this credibility as a step toward distinguishing whether the testimony is likely to be true or false. If I am struck by the fact that the judges at Nuremberg did not pay much attention to the credibility of the prosecution witnesses - especially since they had already decided upon a verdict prior to the trials and only required the testimony to support it -- I am much less impressed when a journalist believes all of these people right from the start. It is well known that journalists are generally supposed to be more skeptical and questioning than most people.

I shall go even further. A man like Dr. Francois Bayle, the author of *Croix Gammée contre Caducée*, to whom I have referred, when faced with the documents and testimonies of Nuremberg, is only half responsible for the conclusions he drew from them.

Dr. Francois Bayle is a doctor in the Navy and is, therefore, a military man. On reading his work one perceives that he has a passionate interest in psycho-somatology and psychoanalysis. The defendants at Nuremberg strike him, above all, as being sick men, or at least, tainted, which amounts to the same thing. How he would have liked to have had the chance to write up their cases! He is a brilliant fellow, and circumstances assisted him. On October 19, 1946, he was appointed to the scientific commission on war crimes, and soon he was at work with the original documents and transcripts of the Nuremberg Trial, at which he was present, and where he had free behind-the-scenes access. As a military man, he did not question the authenticity of the documents that were made accessible to him by the authorities on whom he depended. In the military more than anywhere else the fundamental principle on which the system of hierarchy rests is that "every subordinate owes complete obedience to his superior and submission at all time," and he himself relies on the postulate that a superior may not misuse his subordinate. In this state of mind, Dr. Francois Bayle could not ask questions. And if any questions had occurred to him, not having been prepared for the work in which he was left to orient himself, he would not have been able to answer them correctly. Anyway, he can, therefore, be excused. Those who cannot be excused are his superiors, the ones who allowed him and encouraged him to direct his efforts along the line that is mentioned above. In the main, everything happened as it does in the *Figaro* of Beaumarchais, where the role of mathematician was assigned to a dancer. A historian was needed for the job, and it was given to a medical doctor. Was a doctor also needed because it was a matter of medical analysis? Perhaps, but what I maintain is that the doctor, if he had not been present during the medical experiments and if he was not at the same time a historian, absolutely could not study the documents correctly unless assisted by a historian who would have, previously, verified all of the testimonies and documents which attested to the facts and which described, not the scientific environment -- since for this a historian would not have been qualified -- but the social environment, the historic moment in which they had been performed, particularly, in times as emotional as those in question, and the criminal nature -- if any -- which could be imputed fairly to such conduct. Who was responsible for all this? No one, unless it is whoever is responsible for the distribution of knowledge and the forming of the elites of our times and whoever -- while pushing specialization greatly to the detriment of culture in general on the pretext that an industrial civilization needs more than anything good technicians in well defined and narrowly limited fields -- lets it be believed and, when necessary, sees to it that it is believed that any specialist at all is qualified to speak *ex cathedra* on all specialties.

Mr. Raul Hilberg's case is quite different from that of all these people. He was not deported, he was not a victim of Nazism, and he has no apparent reasons for having a guilty conscience such as Martin-Chauffier, David Rousset, and Eugen Kogon. In addition, he is neither uncultivated, as was that poor cure mentioned above - who invented gas chambers at Buchenwald and Dora, nor a stumbler of hit or miss education like adventurers in the search for subsistence, rather ill-defined before the war, as were David Rousset and Eugen Kogon, who, besides their need to clear their conscience, probably recounted all that they did in order to assure themselves of the best and most lasting post-war livelihood, a goal which they both achieved remarkably well. He is not even like Dr. Francois Bayle, a medical doctor led astray in the study of historical documents. He is a "political scientist," who is properly sheep-skinned, as his biographical note says, who specialized in international relations, and who worked in the "War Documentation Project" of the American government. It is unfortunate that his education in the field of "public law and government," which prepared him to work in a profession in which the science of statistics plays such an important part, did not better equip him for the study of documents and testimonies on which his profession is based and for the study of history in which the social phenomena, which are the subject matter of statistics, have their roots. If, therefore, Mr. Raul Hilberg acts as though he had no idea as to whether a witness and his testimony can be regarded as creditable, or under what conditions a document should be admitted as evidence, he has only one excuse, and that excuse is dishonesty. I say "excuse" because, as I continue to read his biographical note, I find that he is a collaborator in the *Jewish Encyclopedia Handbooks* and, in my judgment, that fact explains everything. And, this particular interest, of course, applies not only to Mr. Raul Hilberg, but to many others. It applies to Mme. Hannah Arendt, for example, who has the same intellectual outlook, who often refers to Mr. Hilberg in her reports of the Eichmann Trial which the *New Yorker* published in five issues (February-March 1963), who was -- or still is -- *Forschungsleiterin* (Research directress) of the Conference on Jewish Relations, *Verwaltungsleiterin* (Directress of administration) of the Jewish Cultural Reconstruction, *Stipendiatin* (Fellow) of the Guggenheim Foundation, and who coolly informs us (*New Yorker*, February 23, 1963) that "3 million Polish Jews were massacred during the first day of the war," the one explaining the other. Mme. Hanna Arendt would do well, in my opinion, to ask Mr. Raul Hilberg where he found the "about 2,000,000 *Polish* Jews, who were transported to their deaths in 1942 and 1943" of whom he speaks on Page 311 of his book. (Emphasis added.) It would be a good thing to come to an understanding: were there in Poland 3 to 3.3 million Jews before the war, as all statisticians unanimously claim, including those who are Jewish, or were there 5,700,000 as Mme. Hannah Arendt is obliged to claim, since here are 5,000,000 exterminated, and, since Mr. Shalom Baron, brandishing his title of Professor of Jewish History at Columbia University, claimed on April 4, 1961, before the Jerusalem Tribunal, that 700,000 of them were still living in 1945 when the country was liberated by Russian troops? Really, one would like to invite all of these people -- these three and the multitude of others in the same boat -- to please get together and agree on their figures, before undertaking to explain us to ourselves. But, Particularly to Mr. Raul Hilberg, one could advise him to agree with himself. On page 670 of his book, he in fact points out to us that of the 9,190,000 Jews, who he says were living in territories occupied by German armies during the war, only 3,782,500 survived, which makes 5,407,500 dead; but on page 767, by some mathematical mystery, these 5,407,500 dead become 5,100,00; It must also be pointed out that for Poland, which together with Russia and

the Danubian countries is the Crux of the problem, he finds only 50,000 survivors, where his colleague Mr. Shalom Baron found 700,000. However, a journal, in French, published in Switzerland (*Europe Réelle*, Lausanne, No. 44, December 1961) claims that the Israeli periodical *Jedoth Hazem*, issued in Tel Aviv (No. 143 of 1961) states, without turning a hair, that "the number of Polish Jews at present living outside of Poland approaches 2 million." By way of compensation, for that part of Russia occupied by German troops, the Paris and Tel Aviv Centers of Jewish Documentation both agree in placing the number of Jews exterminated at 1,500,000 (*Figaro Littéraire*, June 4, 1960), while the Institute of Jewish Affairs and the World Jewish Congress (*Eichmann's Confederates and the Third Reich Hierarchy*, already cited) give the figure of 1,000,000; Mr. Raul Hilberg finds only 420,000. This inconsistency is all a little irresponsible, and it is embarrassing that the supporting documents, which are the same for all, speak so different a language to each of these specialists.

Having said this, let us render unto Caesar what is Caesar's. As far as I know, of all of this kind of writing, (which has been published until now) in which the Nuremberg documents and the appended testimonies have been endlessly hashed and rehashed and in which they have been perverted more and more in order to support the contention that about 6,000,000 Jews were exterminated by the Germans in the Second World War, *The Destruction of the European Jews* is without any doubt the most precise and the most complete in the number of references it contains. For that very reason, without being more convincing than all that has been published in this line, it is the more vulnerable. Moreover, an analysis of Mr. Hilberg's book has one advantage: in displaying all of its weaknesses, those of all the others show up, too. I have, therefore, decided to take *The Destruction of the European Jews* as the point of reference for much of the following discussion. It will, of course, be understood that I will not examine each of the 790 pages one by one, although there is hardly a page that could not be used for illustration. To put each one to the test in detail would require as many pages as Mr. Raul Hilberg needed to present his thesis, and it would be tedious. I have already said that Mr. Raul Hilberg has succeeded in making his documents reveal what he wants them to reveal simply because he accepted them just as they were -- that is, rewritten, picked over, and taken out of their context. It is this context that I shall try to reconstruct by comparing the documents with others and by dwelling only incidentally on the grossest manipulations.

To make myself clearly understood I must make a brief digression, the theme of which is the following: History is a sequence of historical moments. Self-evident? In form, yes. But in implications, quite something else. Some historians think that each moment in history posits to man only those problems which allow a single solution, a Hobson's choice. It then follows that since the beginning of time, all the moments of history, each an exact prolongation of the other, are arranged in a sort of straight line, which is the meaning of history, and that by correctly analyzing each one of them, one arrives at historical determinism. Pursuant to the concept of historical determination, the only question man can possibly ask is, not where he wants to go nor what he should do to get there, but simply, where he is going. For an answer to that question he has only to look behind him and to project the historical line, and then turning forward he sees before him Socialism. At the most, he might hesitate (as before the picture of the turn which Socialism has taken in Russia, for example) and slow his step. In no case can he stop or change directions. The ground burns under his feet, and on each side of his road are deadly precipices. And, so he goes toward Socialism, but

not very fast. Such historians are Marxists, and they were in favor in the nineteenth century. But, by reducing to nothing or almost nothing the role of the individual in history, this theory was so over simplified that it has lost favor in the twentieth century: consequently, Marxian historiography is disappearing today.

On the whole, most historians believe, in fact, that each moment of history presents man with an infinity of problems; that for man each moment holds an infinity of solutions -- even though, without any doubt, only one is rational and good: and that between the good solution and the more or less bad ones, man's choice depends upon a more or less correct conscientious appraisal of the aspects of the problem. Modern historians also think that in this infinity of problems there are some that man can skirt all his life without even suspecting their existence; that among those which he perceives there are some that are more or less important, more or less momentous, and more or less urgent; that, not being able to resolve them all at once, man is obliged to take them one by one in fixed order; and that the very determination of this order already presupposes a correct and conscientious appraisal of the choices among the possible solutions. Depending on the quality of his appraisals -- and, here, we must note that it is a question of collective problems and that the mental age of the group is in inverse proportion to the number of individuals who compose it -- the man in each historic moment sees a more or less large number of problems presented to him. Those that he does not see, however, are not necessarily the most negligible ones.

Returning to Mr. Raul Hilberg, he begins his study several historical moments behind and announces *Luther dixit*, in 1963 no less! I am inventing nothing. In the introduction to *The Destruction of the European Jews*, he seriously explains to us, in substance, that National Socialism descends in a straight line from the anti-Semitism of the Germans in the Middle Ages, from their Catholicism, and from Martin Luther. This assertion calls for a few remarks:

1. Luther was not anti-Semitic, but was anti-Jewish, which is quite a different thing. Historians are of the opinion that there have been eight Semitic peoples (Assyrians, Chaldeans, Phoenicians, Hebrews, Samaritans, Syrians, Arabs, and Ethiopians) of which three are in existence today (Arabs, Hebrews or Jews, and Ethiopians). Catholicism in the Middle Ages and Luther were only against the Jews.
2. This anti-Judaism was of a religious nature only. Equally universalist, both the Roman church of the time and Luther thought that all of the people of the earth except the Jews were pervious to the seductions of their system of propagating the Faith. It went no further.
3. During the Middle Ages all of Europe was religiously anti-Jewish, and to the same degree everywhere. In countries like Holland, where Lutheranism has remained the same as it was in Luther's time, and in other countries like Spain and Hungary, where the Roman church has remained what it was in the Middle Ages, anti-Jewish feeling has been considerably attenuated during the past six centuries. Nevertheless, neither Holland, Spain, nor Hungary was the theater of a phenomenon similar to that of National Socialism. Indeed, in our days it is in Germany that the Church, Lutheran as well as Roman, is the most open to the problems of science!

4. National Socialism itself was anti-Semitic, but only because it was racist. It maintained, for example, the best relations with the Arabs. It would also have maintained good relations with the Jews if they had not, claimed to be a distinct people -- chosen besides! -- in Germany itself. (Its relations with the Arabs would not have been much better had they made the same claim.) The attitude of the Nazis on this point was clearly defined, doctrinally, on the one hand, through its conception of the idea of a people (in one specific area, one race protected against crossbreeding), and, on the other hand, through the international Zionist movement, to which National Socialism attributed a determinant role in the unleashing of the First World War (to get Palestine, it claimed) and in the formulation of the Versailles Treaty (which would permit, it claimed again, the Jewish people, after having gotten Palestine, to take over the Middle East with the help of Bolshevism).

Thus, it was from its very beginning that National Socialism held the Jews responsible for all of Germany's troubles after the Treaty of Versailles. Once in power, the Nazis unceasingly accused them of wanting to provoke a Second World War, in permanent collusion with Bolshevism, in the hope of destroying Germany and, at the same time, of gaining the help of Bolshevism in the Middle East.

These were the two main, fundamental reasons for the policy of National Socialism with regard to the Jews. Anti-Semitism? That is saying both too much and too little; racism is the right word. These reasons, in any case, bear no relation, either by association or affiliation, to the anti-Judaism of the Roman Church in the Middle Ages or to that of Martin Luther, and it is a little embarrassing to have to recall this, if not to teach this, to an American professor of political science, with his university degrees and his apparently solid credentials. But, since 1933 (when Mr. Raul Hilberg was a youngster) and, especially, since 1945 (when he was just leaving adolescence) so many papers and journals have explained, for the benefit of public opinion, that National Socialism traced its roots to Roman Catholicism in the Middle Ages and to Martin Luther, and that, therefore, anti-Semitism and racism were a fundamentally German tradition, that Mr. Raul Hilberg, preeminently a man of preconceived ideas and dogmas, accepted the idea without feeling the need to verify it. In Hilberg's case, it is not even *Luther dixit*, but rather *Vox populi dixit*. To have been correctly informed on this issue, it would have sufficed for him to have read *Das Weltbild des Judentums: Grundlagen des Antisemitismus* by the Austrian Bruno Amman (Vienna, 1939) or *Warum-Woher-Aber Wohin* by the German Hans Grimm (Lippoldsberg, 1954). Although the first was written by a partisan of National Socialism and the second by an independent, they are two of the most serious studies on the origins of National Socialist racism and the answer it expected to find for the Jewish problem because they are the best documented. But, Mr. Raul Hilberg does not seem to find it necessary to read anything more than what comes from the prophets and the political friends.

Once having been caught in this mesh, the only thing that has to be done is to prove that the prophets and the political friends are right. However, since the position of these prophets and political friends is grounded upon various historical inaccuracies, an attempt to justify it historically results in error upon error, because everything is linked together. For example, having a false idea of the origins of National Socialist racism, Mr. Raul Hilberg could not possibly have a correct idea of its historical form. Thus, he states theoretically that Hitler had decided to exterminate the Jews; Chaim

Weizmann and Ben Gurion *dixit*. To support this contention he cites (p. 257) a passage from a famous speech that Hitler made before the *Reichstag* on January 30, 1939:

Today I want to be a prophet once more: if international finance Jewry inside and outside of Europe should succeed once more in plunging nations into another world war, the consequence will not be the Bolshevisation of the earth and thereby the victory of Jewry, but the annihilation of the Jewry race in Europe.

I have already had occasion to remark (with regard to the Hossbach document) that threatening observations of this kind abound in the writings of statesmen the whole world over. Historians usually consider them as representing the kind of defiance that was hurled by the ancient heroes and, as a consequence, attribute little significance to them. Between the two wars Russian statesmen addressed such threats in profusion toward capitalism, and, at the United Nations General Assembly of 1960, Mr. Khrushchev once more bellowed, word for word, the same threat to the Americans while hitting his desk with his shoe. At Nuremberg only once was this passage from the speech cited (T. III, p. 527), but without attaching importance to it. It does not figure in the prosecutor's charge. Mr. Raul Hilberg, doubtless, thinks that was by mistake and heavily insists on citing (p. 266), by way of confirmation of the decision for extermination, another passage from another speech, given in the Sport Palace on September 30, 1942:

At one time, the Jews of Germany laughed about my prophecies. I do not know whether they are still laughing or whether they have already lost all desire to laugh. But right now I can only repeat: they will stop laughing everywhere, and I shall be right also in that prophecy.

But, not only was this passage not sustained at Nuremberg, it was not even cited: in short, it was not serious evidence. On January 30, 1939, the concentration of Jews in camps had not yet begun (according to the Jewish historian Til Jarman, there were only six concentration camps in Germany at the beginning of the Second World War, and they contained, all together, 21,300 internees, of which 3,000 were Jews; *The Rise and Fall of Nazi Germany*, New York, 1956), and, on September 30, 1942, the concentration of Jews which until then had taken place only in Poland (1940-41) was just beginning (March 1942), on a scale similar to that of Poland in other parts of Europe that were occupied by German troops.

Without doubt, Mr. Raul Hilberg had foreseen this objection, since, in nearly 700 pages, he sets before us a methodical plan in four stages: *Definition of the Jew*; *Expropriation*; *Concentration*; and, finally, *Extermination*. Mr. Raul Hilberg could then reply that to carry out an enterprise of such a scope took time, and that in 1942 they could not have gotten very far with the work, but that that does not mean it was not planned. What the basis for that conviction is we do not know. Mr. Raul Hilberg does not offer a single document corroborating this plan, which allows us to presume, in any case, that during peacetime much more time was necessary (1933-1939) to define and expropriate the nearly 600,000 Jews (the total for Germany in 1933. Austria from 1938 on, and Czechoslovakia in 1939) on hand in Germany during that period, than to transport and exterminate 6,000,000 during total wartime conditions

(1941-1944). Not less surprising is this contradiction: after having told us (p. 177) that the intentions of National Socialism were to exterminate the Jews along this methodical plan, Mr. Raul Hilberg then tells us (pp. 2572-58) that "Hitler hesitated in his policy of extermination, until he was convinced that there was no other alternative. From 1938 to 1940 he made the most extraordinary efforts to work out a vast plan of emigration." In another place in his book (p. 256) he wants to prove to us that 1.4 million Jews were exterminated by the *Einsatzgruppen*, but after having used all means to prove it (reports of unit leaders, testimonies of victims who survived, etc.) he is still lacking 500,000 bodies, to come up to his total, so, coolly he adds, on his own authority, 250,000 for "omissions" and 250,000 more for "gaps in our sources." I do not think a better example of this kind of harebrained thinking could be found.

Moreover, light has today been shed on these extermination orders which were allegedly given by Hitler, which show up every fifty or hundred pages in *The Destruction of the European Jews* and which bear all sorts of dates. As I have already stated, in *La Terre Retrouvée* (Paris) of December 15, 1960, Dr. Kubovy, Director of the *World Center of Contemporary Jewish Documentation* at Tel Aviv, has agreed that no extermination order by Hitler, Himmler, Heydrich, Göring, or any other member of the ruling circle of the Third Reich, exists.

If we were to go into further detail, we would find that there is no end to the factual distortions of which Mr. Raul Hilberg is guilty. The following list is a sample of some of them: his presentation of the so-called "Crystal Night" (November 9 and 10, 1938) as having been planned by the high authorities of the Third Reich through the citation of telegrams (all dated November 10, 1938) from minor officials within the ranks of the police and the N.S.D.A.P. (pp. 19 and 655); the *Einsatzgruppen* which he shows as having been in action in Poland in 1939 when such units were not created until May 1941 (see, the testimony of Ohlendorf, N.M.T. IV, p. 322); his interpretation of the German expression "*Judenfrei*" to mean to be "free of Jews" by means of "extermination" when, in reality, the term was applied to a given territory to mean that it was to be "free of Jews" by their transfer into concentration camps or other areas; his distortions of such documents as the "Wannsee Protocol" in which he translates the expression "*weitere Lösungsmöglichkeit*" (meaning, "new solution possibility") as *further solution possibility* (p. 264); his statistical errors where he has some Jews die twice, like the ones at Simferopol, where the city was "freed of the 10,000 Jews who were living there in December 1941, so that the army could have a quiet Christmas" (p.192) and who then were "exterminated in February 1942" (p. 245); his failure to deduct from the total of the exterminated all of those Jews of whom he says (p. 192) that "on the road from Smolensk to Moscow [and] ... in many towns, the Soviets had evacuated the entire Jewish population" (to behind the Urals from which on their own they proceeded on their way to Hong Kong, or southward to Turkey and the Middle East); the 10,000 Jews of Chemigov who numbered only 300 when the Germans arrived (*ibid.*), the 100,000 of Dniepropetrovsk who were only 30,000 (*ibid.*), those of Mariupol and Taganrog who were evacuated to a man by the Soviets (*ibid.*); there appear to be 1,500,000 Jews in all (p. 190) who seem not to have been deducted from the general statistics of total Jewish losses, because otherwise it would not be possible to arrive at a total of 5,407,500 (P. 670) or even of 5,100,000 (P. 767); his crude

errors in figuring such as: 3,350,000 Jews given as living in Poland in 1939 (p. 670), 3,000,000 dead in 1945 (p. 767) but only 50,000 survivors (p. 670), etc.

Of what use is it to continue? I think that I have given a good enough idea of the doctrine and of the method of Mr. Raul Hilberg to convince the reader that he cannot regard *The Destruction of the European Jews* to be an objective piece of scholarship. Now, the time has come to examine Mr. Hilberg's source materials: his witnesses, his testimonies, and his documents.

Chapter Thirteen

Witnesses, Testimonies, and Documents

I. Generalities

Unfolding my usual newspaper on May 17, 1963, my eye was caught by the following: "Legal error uncovered in Austria: innocent persons have been in prison for fifteen years." Then followed the explanation, in the form of a press dispatch from Vienna, dated the day before:

Sentenced sixteen years ago to hard labor for life, two Austrians, Hubert Ranneth, 43, and Joseph Auer, 30, were yesterday set free.

Following a new investigation ordered last November by the Austrian Minister of Justice, light was thrown on one of the worst legal errors of the century.

In 1947 Ranneth and Auer were sentenced for having murdered with iron bars three workmen in a steel works. But it was only last November that an important fact became known. The "complete confession" of Auer, on which the accusation had been based, had been extorted by means of a shot of scopolamine, a euphoric medicine, paralyzing in big doses. Finally the medical experts have established that the iron bar, at the time, the item that led to conviction, could not have been used to murder the victims.

Many good people think that this information offers an explanation for the sensational confessions in the celebrated Moscow trials. It does not seem that this method of Austrian justice was used at Nuremberg, at least not during the thirteen big trials. That drugs might have been used in the multitude of minor trials which have taken place since, against former S.S. or petty bureaucrats of the Third Reich, is quite possible. Most of these cases never came to a hearing except after a long period of imprisonment of the defendants, after having been many times postponed, and that fact raises all sorts of suspicions. The drugging of the defendants seems to have been the case, for example, in the trial of the "Death busses," March 1963, where the accused gave technical details of the operation which experts cannot accept. This could be the case again in the trial of the second commandant of the camp at Auschwitz, where the matter has been under preliminary investigation for three years and where the trial has been postponed four times already. As of the date of this writing, the Prosecutor has still not succeeded in proving that 437,000 Hungarian Jews were gassed at Auschwitz between the 16th of May and the middle of October 1944. Perhaps, that is why the defendant, instead of committing suicide like Gerstein (whose case will be discussed farther on), decided to die of a "heart attack"; in 1963 it has become very difficult to have suicides. This could be the case with Eichmann. Once the first injection is admitted, one is permitted to think that others may have come later, a fact which would explain a lot of things.

Additional means at the disposal of justice include compulsion through bad treatment and physical torture (Streicher, Pohl, Ohlendorf), intimidation (Sauckel, whose wife and nine children in the hands of the Russians were, according to his statement at the Trial of the Major War Criminals, used to exert pressure on him, by the Soviet examiners), psychological torture or "brainwashing," and, finally, the situation that the defendant found himself in with regard to the charges (Höss, Kurt Becher, Höttl, Wisliceny, von dem Bach-Zelewski).

Next followed the witnesses who were not brought to the bar by any charges and who gave evidence without any pressure being exerted on them: the partisans of guilty conscience. One easily understands why the Czech communist, Doctor Blaha, saw a gas chamber in action at Dachau where none existed. It was communist doctrine to say so. Furthermore, as a prisoner belonging to the *Häftlingsführung* of the Dachau camp, this individual could not have had a clear conscience. One can just as easily understand an analogous declaration of the S.S. Hoellriegel concerning other imaginary gas chambers at Mauthausen. It is an example of a guilty conscience in its pure form on the part of a man who had to get himself pardoned for his participation in the drama, and who, furthermore, might have to jump, from one day to the next, from the role of witness to that of defendant. I have explained this factor in connection with the cases of Louis Martin-Chauffier, David Rousset and Eugen Kogon. I could have added to their names the names of others such as the Reverend Father Riquet of the Society of Jesus, Professor Pierre Bertaux and many others who, having given during the German occupation certificates of good conduct to collaborators or *Gestapo* agents, later became fierce upholders of the Resistance orthodoxy in order to excuse their former actions.

The most typical case of this kind of guilty conscience seems to me to be that of the German Pastor Martin Niemöller.

In short, he is a man who could have been at the defendants' bench at Nuremberg under the charge of "Crimes against peace," for having participated in the Nazi "Plot," which the indictment included, from 1920 until 1936. Such a conclusion is inescapable when one reads his own book, *Vom U-Boot zur Kanzel* which came out in Germany in 1935, when Hitler had been in power for two years, and which was written on the theme "*Damals versank mir eine Welt.*" It is the harshest of any indictment of Bolshevism that I have yet read it is also a narrow and chauvinistic profession of faith in nationalism, and it shows the most complete adherence to the general policies of the N.S.D.A.P.

To get pardoned for all that, Pastor Niemöller, President of the Council of the German Protestant Church, in a speech which he gave on July 3, 1946, and which was published under the title *Der Weg ins Freie* (F.M. Hellbach, Stuttgart, 1946), testified that 238,756 persons had been exterminated at Dachau, although we know today that in reality there were only about 30,000 deaths there; he confirmed the existence of a gas chamber, and we know today there was not one there; and since 1945, every time he has opened his mouth to speak, he has preached the unilateral responsibility of Germany, and the collective responsibility of the German people, in the war of 1939-1945. He is today at the head of a pacifist movement, and he defends without exception all of the contentions which are the basis of Soviet Russia's foreign policy. There is no doubt that if he had not conducted himself in the way that he has, he

would have been one of the chief objects of the accusations that the Soviets incessantly make against the Germans. Pastor Niemöller, in short, has the same attitude as all of those people of the Parisian gentry, or of the world of arts and letters, who led a *Dolce Vita* in the company of the highest German personages of occupied Paris, rejoicing in the champagne of Hitler's victories, and who, as soon as the wind turned, gave their allegiance to the communist party and became the most severe denouncers of the collaborators, in postwar France, solely with an eye to escaping the defendants' bench.

It was people like that who gave the prosecutors and the judges at Nuremberg their most striking evidence and who continue to enrich the archives of Rehovot (Israel) and of Warsaw with all those documents, as fanciful as they are new, which are discovered from time to time and which are published to the sound of trumpets in order to keep alive in the world those anti-German feelings on which the world policy of Bolshevism and Zionism depend.

At Nuremberg, the Prosecution and the Judges got sensational results by this method. Notice this curious document P.S. 3319 (N.M.T. XXXII, pp. 159-92) which Mr. Raul Hilberg cites and comments upon (pp. 502-709). In question is the organization, by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Third Reich, of an anti-Jewish congress at Krummhuelbel on April 3 and 4, 1944, with all the representatives at foreign posts participating. In 27 Pages a certain Ludwig Kohlhammer, *Landesgruppenleiter*, reports very exactly on the number of participants -- 31 persons -- and their names and what each one said.

Now, this congress never took place. This is how the matter was presented to the Nuremberg Tribunal:

March 27, 1946, von Steengracht (Secretary of State, Foreign Affairs, Third Reich) is interrogated by Colonel Philimore, deputy prosecutor-general for the English, who asks him:

"I would now like to bring up the question of the Jews. You told us yesterday that you yourself and Mr. Ribbentrop had prevented the anti-Jewish Congress of 1944 from taking place. Is that true?

"Yes," answered von Steengracht. (TX., p. 137.)

And this is what he stated the day before in reply to a question put by Dr. Horn, von Ribbentrop's counsel:

"Our liaison with Hitler informed us that the latter, informed by Bormann, had ordered Rosenberg's office to organize an anti-Semitic congress. Ribbentrop did not want to believe it, but after having had a conversation with the liaison agent, he had to believe it. Since this decision made it impossible for us to prevent the congress through official channels, we tried to prevent it with a policy of hesitation, delay and obstruction. And, although the order had been issued in the spring of 1944, and the war was still not over in April 1945, the congress never took place." (T.X., p. 125.)

On April 2, 1946, von Ribbentrop is interrogated by Mr. Edgar Faure, who at the time was deputy prosecutor-general for France, and who later was to become President of Council in France:

Mr. Edgar Faure (to Ribbentrop): "During the examination of your witness Steengracht, the English prosecutor brought forth document P.S. 3319, which has the English No. G.B. 287. I would like to refer to this document just for one question: In this document appear the minutes of a congress, of a gathering at which were present all the reporters on Jewish matters in the various diplomatic missions in Europe. This congress was held at Krummhuebel on April 3 and 4, 1944. It had been organized by Schleier. That was read the other day. You knew about this congress, I suppose?"

von Ribbentrop: "No, I am hearing about it for the first time. What was that congress? I have not even heard that such a congress took place. What sort of a congress was it?"

Mr. Faure: "The document has been filed with the Tribunal, and I simply want to ask you one question. You have testified that you did not know about this gathering at which were present thirty one persons, almost all of them diplomatic personnel. I point out to you that during this reunion Counsellor of Embassy von Thadden made a declaration which was reported in the following terms:

'The orator is showing why the Zionist solution of Palestine and other similar solutions should be rejected, and why there are grounds for the deportation of the Jews to the eastern territories.'

I suggest that this declaration made by a Counsellor of Embassy before thirty one persons in your department represented your own thesis on the subject."

von Ribbentrop: "Yes, but I do not know at all what you are trying to say. Will you please put the document at my disposal so that I may answer?"

Mr. Faure: "I have no intention of showing you this document (T.X., p. 420)."

That was the proof of forgery. It was also a typical breach of the Rule of Procedure No. 2 of the Tribunal itself which provided that "all the documents appended to the Indictment shall be put at the disposition of the defendants not less than 30 days before the trials" (T.I., p. 21). This matter was never spoken of again. If one looks in the Index of Names (T., 24) for information on *Landesgruppenleiter* Ludwig Kohlhammer, he is not listed. But, Document P.S. 3319 was admitted into evidence. One can hardly understand why. If Mr. Edgar Faure wanted to prove that the Zionist and other similar solutions, according to the thesis of the Reich Minister for Foreign Affairs, were rejected in April, 1944, there was no need to invent a document. It was common knowledge that the main obstacles to these solutions derived from the strategic operational situation, and that, as the affair of Joel Brand proved the following month, the Allies turned them down, through neutrals. One understands

even less how it is that seventeen years later, Mr. Raul Hilberg still does not know that this document was a common forgery.

Shall I speak to Mr. Raul Hilberg about his principal witness on the missions of the *Einsatzgruppen*, *Gruppenführer* Ohlendorf? On January 3, 1946, in the morning session, he said, "On the subject of Jews and communist commissars, the heads of the *Einsatzgruppen* received *verbal* [sic] orders before each mission," and that "on Russian territory [we admire the precision] that meant that they were to be assassinated" (T. IV, p. 322), and in the afternoon session, to the question as to whether this had been arranged in the agreement between the O.K.W. and the R.S.H.A., he replied that "he did not remember, but that in any case that job of liquidation was not mentioned" (T. IV, p. 319). Every two hours he was asked if "most of the heads of the *Einsatzgruppen* came from the R.S.H.A.," to which he replied that "they came from all over the *Reich*," (*op. cit.* p. 325); then, again to the same questions, he stated that "they were furnished by the State police, the *Kripo*, and to a lesser extent by the S.D." (*op. cit.* p. 332). The poor fellow, with the threat of a death sentence hanging over him, had completely lost his head and did not know what Saint to turn to for help to escape his destiny. He was hanged in 1951 in spite of his willingness to please, and after having suffered such treatment! At his trial in 1948, when all that he had said at Nuremberg was brought up against him, he said that all previous declarations had been extorted from him under pressure and were worthless.

The preceding paragraphs are concerned only with the witnesses, testimonies and earlier documents on which Mr. Raul Hilberg bases his work. At Rehovot (Israel) and Warsaw (Poland) the Zionists and Communists have for fifteen years been concentrating on a search for new documents to back up the earlier ones so as not to halt the wave of hatred against Germany, which is playing both Zionism's and Bolshevism's game. The most famous of all these testimonies which have their place on the shelves of the libraries of these two centers is surely the *Diary* of Anne Frank (Paris, Ger. tr. 1958, Calmann-Lévy). This document did not capture the attention of Mr. Raul Hilberg, but some day he might be drawn to consider it. Far from me to claim that it is a forgery. A teacher who lives near Hamburg did this, and he received a heavy sentence. Furthermore, I must admit that this matter did not engross me very much, although I followed it closely enough. What immediately struck me as being most peculiar was the handwriting itself of the unfortunate child. Aside from the fact that if the text is read in the different languages in which it has been printed in none of them are the same things found, the two specimens of the child's handwriting, one is presented by her father in the German edition and the other as shown by *Life* (September 15, 1958), appear to be quite different -- i.e., written by different persons.

I want to be clearly understood. I do not say that the *Diary* of Anne Frank is a forgery. I do not want to make any trouble! I only ask if these two writings are by the same person of the same age, since I am not a graphology expert. After that, I shall decide about the authenticity of the document. Perhaps, Mr. Raul Hilberg will take this problem up

And now, moving from the general to the particular, let us speak a little about the late Messrs. Rudolf Höss, Kurt Gerstein, and Miklos Nyiszli, who, in varying degrees are the stock witnesses of Mr. Raul Hilberg.

II. The Witness Rudolf Hoess

Der Lagerkommandant von Auschwitz spricht

Born in Baden-Baden on November 15, 1900, Rudolf Höss was a soldier in the First World War. As a member of the N.S.D.A.P. from 1922 on, in May 1923, he and two accomplices killed Walter Kadow who had turned over to French occupation troops in the Ruhr Leo Schlageter, a sabotage organizer in the occupation area. Höss was sentenced to ten years but was paroled after serving six.

Höss was a member of the S.S. from 1934 on; while in the S.S., he became a block chief (*Blockführer*) at Dachau at the end of 1934; later he was promoted to manager of the prisoners' belongings and, then, deputy to the commandant of the Sachsenhausen Camp. He served as Commandant at the Auschwitz camp from May 1940 (the camp was not ready for prisoners until June 14) until the end of November 1943. He was arrested for the first time at Heide (Schleswig) in May 1945 by the English, who released him almost immediately, and was arrested again in May 1946 at Flensburg (Holstein), where he was interrogated with "whip and alcohol," as he says in his book, *Le Commandant d'Auschwitz parle*, (p. 211, French ed.). He was then transferred after a few days "to Minden on the Weser, an interrogation center in the British zone," where he suffered "the most brutal treatment from the military prosecutor, an English commander." (*ibid.*) He came to Nuremberg at the beginning of April as a defense witness for Kaltenbrunner. He testified at Nuremberg on May 15, under threat of being turned over to the Soviets. Knowing what treatment they had in store for him, it was quite natural that he said what he thought was best calculated to keep the Americans from doing that. Professor Gustav Gilbert, a psychologist attached to the prosecution staff, was at the Trial and, encouraging this hope, adroitly suggested what he should say. He did not complain about his treatment at Nuremberg: on the contrary, he said it was a "health cure" (p. 211) when compared with what he had undergone at Heide and Minden. Unfortunately for him, he was claimed as a war criminal by Poland, and was transferred there on May 25 where, on July 30, he was incarcerated in the Krakow prison. At Krakow he experienced a change of scene that was much worse than Heide and Minden, and "without the intervention of the Prosecutor they would have finished me off," he said (p. 214). His case was heard from the 11th to the 29th of March, 1947. He was condemned to death on April 2 by the Warsaw Supreme Court and was hanged on the 4th at Auschwitz.

In prison, while waiting his trial, he wrote his memoirs. For this purpose, he was given not a pen and ink but "a pencil." The advantage, for those who wish to exploit it, is that facsimiles -- and surely the originals, too -- from pencil writings are almost illegible. It follows that authenticity can only be attested by experienced specialists, the kind who work on Egyptian palimpsests, and so far the original manuscript has not been submitted to one, if my information is correct. The original document is in the Auschwitz Museum where the International Committee of the camp has custody of it, and where its inspection by scholars has been carefully restricted. Just try to examine it there! To my knowledge, one part of it has been published in German entitled *Autobiography* (1951), but it does not seem to have been translated into any other language except Polish. As far as I know only a few fragments, cited by authors more fortunate than I (for example, Michel Borwicz, *Revue d'histoire de la seconde guerre mondiale*, October 1956, pp. 56-87) have appeared until now. Another part was published with the title, *Le Commandant d'Auschwitz parle* (1959) in French,

English, German and Polish. It seems that the whole manuscript has not yet been published and that, at the present time, specialists are studying and preparing the rest for publication, doubtless in "pencil" too. It looks like there are many fine days ahead for the historians. In short, together with the testimony of the author at Nuremberg, on the same subject, we have at hand three texts from the same person. What do these texts say?

The judgment of the Supreme Court at Warsaw which sentenced Höss to death and which served as the introduction to *Le Commandant d'Auschwitz parle* (pp. 9-13, French ed.) charges him with taking part in the killing of:

- about 300,000 persons confined in the camp as prisoners, and listed in the camp register.
- a number of people, whose exact number is difficult to determine, but at least 2,500,000 mostly Jews brought to the camp by wagons from all over Europe for immediate extermination, and not in the camp register for that reason.
- at least 12,000 Soviet prisoners of war held in the concentration camp contrary to the law of nations with regard to the treatment of prisoners.

Therefore, the Polish court claimed that 2,912,000 persons in all for the period from May 1940 to the end of November 1943 died at Auschwitz. By assuming that this figure was correct, and by adding those who were exterminated from the end of November 1943 to January 1945, witnesses at Nuremberg spoke of 4,500,000 dead. In October 1956, Mr. Henri Michel, a former French deportee and the editor-in-chief of the *Revue d'histoire de la seconde guerre mondiale*, put the total number of dead at Auschwitz at 4,000,000, in this way: "This camp was the most international and the most western of the death factories, and its soil is enriched with the ashes of four million corpses." (p. 3.)

In reply to the question put by Dr. Kaufmann, Kaltenbrunner's legal counsel at Nuremberg, "Did Eichmann tell you in fact that more than 2,000,000 Jews were destroyed at Auschwitz camp?", Höss answered, "Yes, that is right." (T. XI, p. 409.) Behind the scenes he is supposed to have told the American psychologist, Gustave Gilbert that "Every day two trains brought in 3,000 persons, for 27 months" (therefore, for the whole length of the period of deportation, from March 1942 to July 1944). "So that makes a total of about 2,500,000 people." (Statement of Professor Gilbert before the Jerusalem Tribunal in judgment on Eichmann, May 30, 1961.) But, when it came to giving details about these 2,500,000 people he wrote in the *Le Commandant d'Auschwitz parle* (p. 239, French ed.):

As for me, I never knew the total number, and had no way of determining it. I can only remember the number in the most important cases, often pointed out to me by Eichmann or one of his deputies:

- From Upper Silesia, or Poland in general: 250,000
- From Germany, or Theresienstadt: 100,000

-- Holland: 95,000

-- Belgium: 20,000

--France[2]: 10,000

--Greece: 65,000

--Hungary: 400,000

-- Slovakia 90,000

TOTAL: 1,130,000

The figures concerning cases of less importance are not graven in my memory, but they were insignificant compared with the above. I think the figure 2,500,000 much too high.

These figures, too, have to do with the whole period of deportation and Höss got them from Eichmann. And, Eichmann definitely did have things to say about the matter, but when Höss' statement at Nuremberg is compared with his book, we see that these things do not always agree.

It is my opinion that very few Jewish deportees came to Auschwitz from countries other than those which appear on Höss' list. It is possible that this total corresponds to the reality, although it is still very high. Apparently, this realization was admitted by the Institute of Jewish Affairs in *Eichmann's Confederates and the Third Reich Hierarchy* when it concluded that " at Auschwitz, [together with its satellite camps, best known of which was Birkenau, located to the south not far from Krakow]... about 90,000 Jews perished." Probably, Mr. Raul Hilberg referred to this estimate, too, in order to figure at a million (p.572) the number of Jews who died there. What is the basis for the estimation of the number of survivors, one of 230,000, and the other of 130,000? Neither in *Eichmann's Confederates and the Third Reich Hierarchy* nor in *The Destruction of the European Jews* is there an explanation of how these figures were determined. Therefore, they are probably conjectural. In Mr. Raul Hilberg's case, it is a little troublesome because (p. 670) he finds only 50,000 survivors for the whole of Poland, which is astonishing considering that there were already 130,000 at Auschwitz.

But, we shall not anticipate the discussion of the general statistics which will follow in another chapter; we are concerned here with the witness Höss, not the general statistics. And, about those two trains that for 27 months brought 3,000 people to Auschwitz every day, witness Höss does not seem very certain. On this subject I invite the reader to think about these three propositions:

1. "As far as I can remember the convoys arriving at Auschwitz never carried more than 1,000 prisoners." (p. 220.)
2. "Following some delays in communications, five convoys a day, instead of the expected three, arrived." (p. 236.)

3. "In the extermination of Hungarian Jews, convoys were arriving at the rate of 15,000 persons a day." (p. 239.)

From which it appears that under certain circumstances five trains per day of 1,000 persons each delivered a total of 15,000 persons.

To the Tribunal on April 15, 1946, Höss had stated that these trains carried 2,000 persons each (T. Xi, p. 412). To Professor Gustave Gilbert he said that they contained 1,500 each, and in his book, he comes down to 1,000. What is certain is that for the period given none of these estimates on the capacity of the trains corresponds to a total of 1,130,000. The last one is the closest to the truth with an exaggeration of only 300,000. Since Mr. Raul Hilberg takes under consideration six "killing centers," an exaggeration of 300,000 for each one would yield a total exaggeration of nearly 2,000,000 persons and, out of six million a total exaggeration of that magnitude is quite important.

The same observation holds for the soundness of this testimony: "In the middle of spring, 1942, *hundreds* of human beings perished in the gas chambers." (p. 178.) But, as we have seen, Document No. 4401 establishes beyond any doubt that the so-called "gas chambers" were not ordered for Auschwitz until August 8, 1942, and Document No. 4463 establishes that they were not actually installed until February 20, 1943. At Nuremberg, Höss had already stated in his deposition that "in 1942, Himmler came to visit the camp and was present at an execution from beginning to end," (T.XI, p. 413), no one called his attention to the fact that even if it were possible that Himmler had gone to Auschwitz in 1942, it was not possible for him to have been present at an execution, since the gas chambers had not been constructed yet. And, furthermore, we know that it would have been unlikely for Himmler to have been present at an execution because as we learned after the war from his physician, Dr. Kersten, he could not bear the sight of an execution.

Höss' comments concerning the capacity of the gas chambers and the crematories also are grossly contradictory. For example, he says on one page that:

The maximum figure for the number of people gassed or incinerated every 24 hours was a little more than 9,000 for *all* the installations. (p. 236, emphasis added.)

But, then, he says a few pages later:

As I have already said, Crematories I and II could incinerate about 2,000 *bodies* in 24 hours; it was not possible to exceed this if one wanted to avoid damage. Installations III and IV were supposed to incinerate 1,500 *corpses* in 24 hours. But, as far as I know, these figures were never reached. (p. 245, emphasis added.)

How can one fail to deduce from these flagrant contradictions that here is a document which was fabricated hastily after the event by illiterates?

Moreover, this fabrication, after the event, can be detected just from the kind of book it is, written in pencil and carefully preserved in the archives of the Auschwitz

Atuseum, where, unless one is a well-known communist, one cannot examine it. Although it bears the date of February-March 1947, it became known and published only in 1958; this fact further clouds the reliability of the document. In addition, it is attributed to a dead man who, in any case, cannot protest what is said over his signature; this fact, in itself, tells all too much.

Finally, a careful analysis of the following language reveals a pearl:

Toward the end of 1942, all the mass graves were cleaned [crematory ovens had not been built yet, and incineration was done in mass graves]. The number of cadavers buried there exceeded 107,000. This figure [as Rudolph Höss explains farther on] includes not only convoys of Jews gassed from the beginning, until the moment when they went on to incineration, but also the cadavers of all the prisoners who died in Auschwitz-Birkenau camp. (p. 231)

From this statement one infers that in nearly three years 107,000 persons died. I say "in nearly three years" because the two phrases, "toward the end of 1942" and "until the moment when they went on to incineration," are paradoxical, since the cremations could not have been begun, according to the official thesis, before February 20, 1943. Therefore, for the two to be concomitant, which is called for here, it is absolutely necessary that both should have occurred on this last date. Since the camp was opened on June 14, 1940, one has to speak of almost three years. Hence: the cremation of 107,000 cadavers before February 1943 must mean that all of the rest were cremated at a later date. Taking into account that between February 1943 and October 1944 (the official end of the exterminations) there are 17 months and that, as the *Kasztner Report* tells us, for 8 or 9 months (the autumn of 1943 to May 1944) the gas chambers at Auschwitz were out of order and not working, it remains to be established how many persons more than 107,000 could have been "incinerated," from February 1943 to October 1944, when the camp was equipped with four crematory ovens of 15 burners each. I would be very astonished if a cremation expert, given these facts, should reply that it was possible to cremate the million bodies that are claimed by Mr. Raul Hilberg, or even the 900,000 of the Institute of Jewish Affairs. And, here we must also remember that Eichmann gave May 15, 1944, as the date when Himmler ordered that cremation be stopped and that, therefore, the period during which the killings and the cremations took place -- if they took place -- could not have been longer than 5 or 6 months (March-Fall 1943).

But, there it is a question of how much credence can be given to Höss' different versions, and after what we have seen I should imagine that his credibility is very limited.

What follows is, unhappily for Mr. Hilberg, not much more convincing. Witness what Höss says about the development or the final solution in the direction of extermination.

We have seen that when he visited the camp in March 1941, Himmler told Höss about his intention to transform the camp into "a great armament plant, which would keep 100,000 war Prisoners occupied." Therefore, at that date, Auschwitz was not destined for the extermination of Jews, and so Mr. Raul Hilberg's contention -- based upon a speech of Hitler's on January 30, 1939, that after such extermination was decided

upon, it was carried out according to a mathematically progressive plan that already had been worked out -- is destroyed.

On the contrary, there seems to have been no planned extermination. In fact, it seems that gas was used for the first time to kill prisoners without any order whatsoever, with gassing apparatus that was makeshift, and without anyone in a responsible position in the camp, from top to bottom, expecting it:

During one of my business trips (1942) my substitute, *Schutzhaftlager* Fritsch, made use of gasses with a group of political officers of the Red Army. For this he used cyanide (Zyklon B) which he had at hand, because it was used all the time as an insecticide. He informed me as soon as I returned. (Page 172)

Thus, from the fortuitous initiative of a subaltern is supposed to have arisen the method which was supposed to have been used on a massive scale against the Jews.

Many times, in his work. Rudolf Höss says (or he is made to say) that verbal orders from the highest government offices, particularly that of Himmler, told him to exterminate the Jews with gas, but, he then adds, "We never got a clear-cut decision on this matter from Himmler" (p. 233). Moreover, when Höss was all for gassing on a large scale, he states that, "I often brought this up in reports, but I could do nothing against pressure from Himmler who always wanted more prisoners for armaments factories" (p. 189). So now, Himmler was against the gassings? In any case, it is not clear how Himmler could have had more and more prisoners for munitions work if he was exterminating more and more with gas.

In addition, we must note that when Himmler verbally asked Höss to construct gas chambers at Auschwitz (in the summer of 1941), Höss "submitted a detailed plan of the proposed installations." About these plans, he stated, "I never had an answer or a decision on this matter" (p. 227). Nevertheless, gas chambers were constructed, because, says Höss, "... later Eichmann casually told me [-- verbally, therefore; everything is verbal in this business! --] that the *Reichsführer* approved" (p. 227). Himmler, then, could never have given the order to construct the gas chambers -- the admission is tremendous! It seems that Himmler wanted at one and the same time to destroy as many and as few as possible of the same people. Höss adds that:

The Jewish prisoners under his [Himmler's] jurisdiction were to be treated with every consideration They could not do without the great supply of manpower, especially in the armament industries. (Page 191)

It does not clarify matters to look into the method used for extermination. We have seen above that the gas used was an insecticide, Zyklon B, which was used, Höss tells us, for all asphyxiations after the gassing of the political officers of the Red Army. It is strange, to say the least, that to carry out such an order, even given verbally, that some gas other than an insecticide was not provided (3).

Be that as it may, this is what Zyklon B is: "Zyklon B exists in the form of blue pellets, delivered in boxes, out of which gas is formed under jets of water vapor." (p. 228.) But, as we shall see further on, Dr. Miklos Nyiszli claimed that the gas was formed on contact with air. It was so dangerous to handle that after it had been used in

a room, the room "had to be aired for two days" before it was safe to go in that room again (p. 229), but the gassing of the Jews "lasted on an average of half an hour" (P. 173), after which "the doors were opened and the *Sonderkommando* immediately began the work of clearing out the cadavers" (p. 230, emphasis added). In fact, sometimes they dragged "... the corpses out while eating and smoking" (p. 180) and without incurring the least harm. Equally incredible is the account of the first extermination which took place in a morgue. In order to get the gas in there, "while they were unloading [the future victims from] the trucks, several holes were rapidly made in the stone and concrete walls of the morgue" (P. 172). We are not told how the necessary water vapor was let in, nor how the holes were stopped up after the blue pellets were put in; no doubt, that was done rapidly too, with old rags.

I would like to add that in addition to the contradictions that can be uncovered from one page to another in *Le Commandant d'Auschwitz parle* and in addition to those which appear when it is compared with what its author said at Nuremberg, the testimony on Auschwitz-Birkenau is written in a style that is strangely similar to the public confessions of the defendants in the famous Moscow trials, which no one in Western Europe took seriously. Perhaps, this strange style is further corroboration of my contention that Höss' memoir is a fraud. Arthur Koestler told the whole story in his *Le Zéro et l'Infini* -- I must not fail to refer to that!

III. The Witness Miklos Nyiszli

Doctor at Auschwitz

In March 1951, in *Les Temps Modernes*, a monthly review run by Jean-Paul Sartre, a certain Tibere Kremer presented, with the title *S.S. Obersturmführer Docteur Mengele*, and subtitle, *Journal d'un médecin déporté au crématorium d'Auschwitz*, a piece of false evidence concerning that camp which will remain one of the most abominable pieces of trickery of all time. The author was, he said, a Hungarian Jew named Miklos Nyiszli, a medical doctor by profession, as is indicated in the sub-title. The article contained 27 pages of selected extracts from the doctor's memoir (pp. 1655-1672). The April issue of the review devoted 31 more pages (pp. 1655-1886). This false evidence had just been presented to American public opinion by Mr. Richard Seaver, with a preface by Professor Bruno Bettelheim. It was only in 1961 that it was published as a whole, in German, by the Munich illustrated weekly *Quick* in five issues (January to February) under the title *Auschwitz*, and, in French, by Julliard Publishers in a volume of 256 pages with the title *Médecin à Auschwitz*, and the sub-title *Souvenirs d'un médecin déporté*.

It made a sensation in France in 1951. The trial over *Le Mensonge d'Ulysse* was in full swing, and in the eyes of the public I had the blackest of souls. In 1961 it made a sensation again, but the world over this time -- the Eichmann trial was in full swing.

The things he had to say, this Doctor Miklos Nyiszli! And, in addition, he gave the first detailed account of all the horrors that took place at Auschwitz, including the exterminations in the gas chambers in particular. Among other things, he claimed that in this camp was a gas chamber, 200 meters long (width was not given), together with

three others of similar dimensions. They were used to asphyxiate 20,000 persons a day, and four crematory ovens, each with 15 burners, incinerated the victims as the operation proceeded. He added, in another connection, that 5,000 other persons were, every day, done away with by less modern means in two immense open air hearths. And, he added again that for eight months he had been personally present at these systematic massacres. Finally (this is on page 50 Of the Julliard edition), he stated specifically that when he arrived at the camp (about the end of May 1944 at the earliest) the exterminations by gas, at the rate cited above had been "going on for four years."

From the aforementioned testimony, the following contradictions can be gleaned. First, this fellow did not know that if there were gas chambers at Auschwitz they had not been installed or made ready to work until February 20, 1943 (Document No. 4463, already cited).

Second: He did not know that the area of the gas chambers, officially and respectively, was 210 square meters for the first (the very one he mentioned), 400 square meters for the second, and 580 square meters for the last two. In other words, the gas chambers which he saw, and whose operation he describes so minutely, must have been only 1.05 meters wide. In fact, it must have resembled a long hall. Since he states precisely that down the middle of the chamber there was a row of columns With holes from which the gas came out (these columns came up through the roof, and into these openings hospital attendants wearing Red Cross arm bands threw the tablets of Zyklon B), that there were along the walls on both sides benches for sitting (surely not very wide, those benches!) and that 3,000 persons (they were gassing batches of 3,000!) could move about easily in the room, I claim that one of two things is true: either this Dr. Miklos Nyiszli never existed, or, if he did exist, he never set foot in the places that he describes.

Third: If the gas chambers at Auschwitz, together with the open hearths, exterminated 25,000 people a day for four and a half years (since according to this "witness" they continued to exterminate for six months after his arrival) that makes a total of 1,642 days. And at the rate of 25,000 persons per day for 1,642 days, there would have been 41 million cadavers, a little more than 32 million in gas chambers and a little less than 9 million in the open hearths.

I shall add that even if it had been possible for the four gas chambers to asphyxiate 20,000 persons a day (at the rate of 3,000 per batch, as the witness says), it was absolutely not possible to cremate that many at the same time, even if there were 15 burners and even if the job took only 20 minutes, as Dr. Miklos Nyiszli also falsely claims. Taking these figures for a basis, the capacity of the ovens, all working together, could not have consumed more than 540 corpses per hour, or 12,960 for the 24-hour day. At this rate the ovens could not have been put out until several years after the liberation. And only then on the condition that not a minute was lost for nearly ten years. Now, from information from Père-Lachaise on how long it takes to incinerate three bodies where there is one burner, we see that the ovens at Auschwitz are still burning, and that they are not anywhere near ready to be put out!

Since, I have made my point regarding the ovens, I shall pass over the two open air hearths (which were, our witness says, 50 meters long, 6 wide, and 3 deep and in

which were burned 9 million cadavers during their four and a half years of operation) without further comment.

Fourth: There is another impossibility, at least as far as extermination by gas is concerned, since, if there were gas chambers at Auschwitz, they were not officially operating except from February 20, 1943 to November 17, 1944, or for 17 or 18 months. The number of deaths by this means, based on Dr. Miklos Nyiszli's facts, would then be about 11 million, and with the 9 million of the open hearts, about 20 million, which -- by some unknown mathematical process -- are reduced to 6 million by Tibere Kremer in his presentation of this "testimony."

Fifth: That is not all. This Dr. Miklos Nyiszli is as much in contradiction with himself as he is with all those who testified before or after him about Auschwitz. The following is a comparison of his testimony with that of the others: it is he who says (p. 56) that the gas was produced from pellets of Zyklon B "on contact with air!" Höss told us that it was "in contact with water vapor." It is he who tells us (p. 56) that "in five minutes" everyone was dead, according to Höss the Zyklon B took "half an hour." Again, it is Dr. Nyiszli who tells us (p.36) that the Hungarian Jews were transported to Auschwitz at the rate of "four or five trains a day," each of which contained forty cars, which, in turn, contained 80 persons (p. 15), or 3,200 persons altogether, but a few pages later, he says that they, each carried "about five thousand people..." (p. 18).

This last statement must cause surprise, since we know that the deportation of Hungarian Jews lasted for 52 days (May 16 to July 7, 1944) according to the *Kasztner Report*, and that the *Histoire de Joel Brand* agrees on this point, Höss said at Nuremberg that the deportation took "a period of four to six weeks." (T.XI, p. 412.) Let us make some calculations concerning the four possibilities:

1st: 4 trains of 3,600 persons equal 14,000 persons per day, and for 52 days yield 748,000 persons

2nd: 4 trains of 5,000 persons equal 20,000 persons per day, and for 52 days yield 1,040,000 persons

3rd: 5 trains of 3,600 persons equal 18,000 persons per day, and for 52 days yield 936,000 persons

4th: 5 trains of 5,000 persons equal 25,000 persons per day, and for 52 days yield 1,300,000 persons

But, in statistics from Jewish sources, the highest figure given for Hungarian Jews is 437,000 (4). I leave it up to the reader to figure out this odd item. I shall add that the *Kasztner Report* tells us that on March 19, 1944, Eichmann arrived in Budapest with a company of 150 men and that 1,000 rail cars were at his disposal to carry out the transportation of the Jews. If, as Dr. Miklos Nyiszli, says, the trip lasted four days -- which is plausible; it took that long to go from Compiègne to Buchenwald in the convoy I was in -- then after six days there were no more cars in the railway station at Budapest! Consequently, the work of deportation was halted until the 9th day when empty cars began returning. And, this estimation is made without taking into

consideration the number of railway carriages that were necessary to bring to the assembly points all of the Jews who had been rounded up all over Hungary. The court of the Jerusalem Tribunal that condemned Eichmann to death moreover completely destroyed this testimony in stating (in Exhibit No. 12) that "in less than two months 434,351 persons were deported in 147 sealed freight trains, with 3,000 persons in each train, men, women and children, two or three trains a day on the average," and so, as we shall see farther on, this new version is not any better.

The passages in the testimony of Dr. Miklos Nyiszli where he contradicts himself are numberless: the crematory in action, his nose and throat assailed "by the smell of flesh burning and *hair scorching*," (p. 19); "the hair of the dead is clipped off" (p. 60), *after* removal from the gas chamber and *before* incineration; then, "coarse hands cut off the tresses of their well-kept hair" (p. 168), *before* they were sent to the bathing place and then to the gas chamber. And, so it goes.

But, what is more significant than the contradictions in the texts themselves is what one finds by comparing the French version of this so-called testimony with the German version which appeared in the Munich illustrated weekly *Quick* in successive issues after January 15, 1961. In the latter version, the crematories all together are not incinerating more than 10,000 persons a day instead of 20,000. A pistol shot which hits the target at 40 to 50 meters in French, does so only at 20 to 30 meters in German. An institute which was "the most celebrated in the Third Reich" in the one case becomes "the most celebrated in the world" in the second. "Pretty rugs" become "Persian carpets." Auschwitz camp which could hold "up to 500,000 persons" in the French version is no more than "gigantic" in the German version, all precision, having disappeared, without doubt, because between 1951 and 1961 the author -- long since dead, as we shall see -- discovered through an intermediary that at Nuremberg Höss had stated that "it held up to 140,000 persons." (T. XI, p. 416.) A distance of three kilometers is reduced to 500 meters, or vice versa, etc.

One of two things can be concluded from the preceding discussion: either it is an authentic document, in which case it should be the same in 1951 as in 1961, in its French and in its German versions, or, if it is not the same, then it is apocryphal. The fact that the two versions do not agree with each other in almost any respect and that neither one agrees with the descriptions, for example, that were derived from the documents produced at Nuremberg permits one to maintain, at least, that this Dr. Miklos Nyiszli never set foot in Auschwitz. That fact I suspected after having read the very first page of his testimony. Did he not say of the convoy of which he was a part that after "leaving behind us the Tatra mountains, we went past the stations of Lublin and Krakow" (in order to get to Auschwitz from the Hungaro-Rumanian frontier). This statement proves that in addition to not knowing the camp at Auschwitz he did not know the route to get to it either. And, to think that a publishing house was found in Paris that would place such utter nonsense as this testimony before the public!

In April, 1951, when the extracts from his testimony were published by *Les Temps Modernes*, I wrote to him. In October of the same year he answered, through the agency of Mr. Tibere Kremer, that actually "2,500,000 persons had been exterminated in the gas chambers at Auschwitz . . ." In February 1961, after having read the entire text in *Quick*, I decided to write to Mr. Tibere Kremer. The letter was returned to me with the notation "no longer at this address" stamped on it. I next wrote to Dr. Nyiszli

in care of *Quick*, and I was told that my letter could not be forwarded to Dr. Nyiszli because he was dead.

In November 1961, after having read the entire text in the French version, I wrote to Julliard Publishers, asking them kindly to forward the enclosed observations to Mr. Tibere Kremer, whose address they surely must have since they had just published his translation. I added:

Historic documents are rightly respected and versions of them should not be published unless their authenticity is guaranteed. It happens that for ten years, in connection with my research, I have been seeking the original of this one, and no one has ever been able to tell me where it can be consulted. The best qualified historians in the world know nothing about it. The versions which have been published are divergent and contradict each other on every page. The author speaks of places which he has obviously not been to, etc. Therefore, if you could give me sufficient assurance to allow me to state "authentic document" in the case of Dr. Nyiszli, in the references in my work, I would be very much obliged.

On the 8th of December, in the name of Julliard Publishers, of which he is one of the literary directors, Mr. Pierre Javet answered:

Thank you very much for having sent me a typewritten copy of your letter of November 16th.

I am forwarding it today to Mr. Tibere Kremer, translator of Dr. Miklos Nyiszli's "Médecin a Auschwitz," so that he may reply to you.

Meanwhile, I may tell you that it is true that Doctor Nyiszli is dead, but his wife is still alive. Moreover, I have showed his book to several deportees who have confirmed its authenticity.

I am still waiting for an answer from Mr. Tibere Kremer. However, it is quite probable that I shall never receive it. First, as we have said, on October 24, 1951, Mr. Tibere Kremer sent on to me a reply from Dr. Nyiszli to my letter of April, 1951. Then as a result of my continued research concerning this singular witness, I learned from New York, where the book was published in 1951, that Dr. Nyiszli *had died long before his testimony was first published*. If this fact is true, this dead witness -- another one -- was thoughtful enough to write to me after his death. And, so Mr. Tibere Kremer's silence is understandable. No further comment is necessary.

IV. The Witness Kurt Gerstein

June 6, 1961: The Jerusalem Tribunal in judgment on Eichmann is overwhelmed with testimonies on the subject of the extermination of Jews that was said to have taken

place at the camp at Belzec. All of the journalists reporting the hearings say just about what this one from *Le Figaro* (Paris, June 7, 1961) says:

The third extermination camp in question [at the hearing of June 6 during the Eichmann trial], that of Belzec located between Lublin and Lemberg, had only one survivor at the war's end, and he has since died.

The prosecutor bases his case on a series of depositions made before Allied officers by Kurt Gerstein, lieutenant in the Health Service of the Waffen S.S., who afterwards hanged himself in a military prison in Paris. Gerstein had been ordered by Eichmann to look into quicker poisons.

And, here again in the limelight is Kurt Gerstein, as he was in January 1946 at the Nuremberg trial and as he was recently in Germany in the drama *Der Stellvertreter* (Hamburg, 1963) by a certain Rolf Hochhuth. It is a story as gruesomely phantasmagorical as that of Dr. Miklos Nyiszli.

In the very first days of May 1945 (the 5th, it seems) French troops on going into Rottweil (Wurttemberg) found and took prisoner in a hotel a certain Kurt Gerstein. He was wearing the uniform of the S.S. with the epaulettes of a *Obersturmführer*. He was taken to Paris where he was interned in a military prison, according to some, in the Cherche-Midi, according to others, or in the prison at Fresnes, still others said, where he is said to have committed suicide. In short, no one knows exactly where he was imprisoned. As for when he died, a morning in July -- the 25th almost all the annotators say, in particular, Professor H. Rothfels (*Vierteljahrshefte für Zeitgeschichte*, No. 2, April 1953, p. 185) -- is given, but nothing could be less certain. On March 10, 1949, the widow Gerstein is said to have announced that she received from the *Ecumenical Commission for the Spiritual Aid of War Prisoners*, headquartered at Geneva, only the following terse communication on the death of her husband:

Unfortunately, in spite of repeated attempts, it has not been possible to learn more about the death of your husband, nor can the whereabouts of the grave be determined.

At the present moment neither the arrest, nor the death of the man, seem to have been made public. At least, there has been no publication to my knowledge. In any case, it was only on January 30, 1946, that this fact became sensational news through the attention drawn to it by some first class blunderers.

Without doubt, the first and best known of these blunderers was Mr. Dubost, the French prosecutor at the trial of the Major War Criminals at Nuremberg. In the archives of the American delegation he had found a number of invoices for Zyklon B that had been furnished to the Auschwitz and Oranienburg concentration camps by DEGESCH Gesellschaft, of Frankfurt/M; they were dated April 30, 1944, and were appended to an account in French, signed by Kurt Gerstein, *Obersturmführer* of the S.S., which pertained to the extermination of Jews in the gas chambers at Belzec, Chelmno, Sobibor, Majdanek and Treblinka; the account does not give the date of these exterminations. (T. VI, pp. 345-347.) Subsequently, Mr. Hans Rothfels tells us (*Vierteljahrshefte f. Z., op. cit.* p. 177) that this document was made use of by the

prosecution in the German language, in its principal passages, as evidence at the so-called "trial of the doctors," which was conducted at Nuremberg on January 16, 1947. And, then, the part about Zyklon B and the appended invoices were used at the trial of the DEGESCH Gesellschaft at Frankfurt in January 1949.

The date of this document, April 26, 1945, was made public for the first time at the "trial of the doctors." And, until the article of Mr. Hans Rothfels, mentioned above, only the French version was used, which for various legal purposes was translated into German. In *Le Bréviaire de la Haine* (Paris, 1951, pp. 220 ff.), Mr. Poliakov gives this French version, but without the date. In 1959, Heydecker and Leeb in *Le Procès de Nuremberg* do the same. In *Der Gelbe Stern* (Hamburg, 1961) Mr. Schoenberger gives the date as May 4, 1945. But in 1961, Exhibit No. 124 of the Jerusalem Tribunal which condemned Eichmann gives no date, and, furthermore, the French version therein is in no way similar to the version that was published by Mr. Poliakov in 1951. What is remarkable is the fact that it is thanks to Mr. Poliakov that we know about this second version (*Le Procès de Jerusalem*, Paris, 1962, p. 224 ff.) and that he gives it, apparently without remembering that it was he who gave us the first.

We had to wait for the "trial of the doctors," in January 1947, for that of the DEGESCH Gesellschaft, in January 1949, and -- above all -- for the article, cited above, by Mr. Rothfels, in order to learn how this document got into the archives of the American delegation, where Prosecutor Dubost had found it, together with not only the two invoices from DEGESCH Gesellschaft that are mentioned above, but 12 of them, bearing dates between February 14 and May 31, 1944. At the same time, we learned that the French version, composed of six typewritten pages ending with a handwritten statement attesting to the authenticity of the contents, followed by the signature of the author (*Vierteljahrshefte f. Z.*, op. cit. p. 178), had two more attached pages, also handwritten and signed, but in English, bearing the same date, in which Gerstein said that not more than four or five people had been able to see what he had seen. There was one more page in which he asked that his statement not be made public before finding out whether Pastor Niemöller had died at Dachau or had survived, plus 24 typewritten pages in German with a handwritten note, dated May 4, 1945, but not signed (*Vierteljahrshefte f. Z.*, op. cit. p. 179). It seems -- at least that is what Mr. Rothfels tells us -- that this German version in 24 pages, and the French version, are "on the whole identical on all points." Since there are two different French versions, the one published by Mr. Poliakov and the one that was Exhibit No. 124 at Jerusalem, nothing is lost in asking him which of the two he takes as his basis for comparison.

Now, let us return to these two French versions. In January 1946 the Americans had not yet realized the importance of this document -- which existed in two versions, even three versions if one believes Mr. Rothfels -- and they did not think it was worth being produced in evidence against the defendants at the Tribunal. Fortunately, Mr. Dubost was there. On January 30, 1946, he brought it out of his brief case, and submitted it as reference P.S. 1553-RF. However, before we discuss what happened, we should first learn a little more about its author Kurt Gerstein.

Who was Kurt Gerstein? To this question, no answer is to be found anywhere in the forty-two volume report of the proceedings of the Nuremberg Trial. For reasons

which the reader will not fail to understand, the Tribunal, in fact, did not want to hear anything about either Kurt Gerstein or his testament; out of the bundle of documents that were produced by Mr. Dubost, it accepted only two invoices of April 30, 1944, each for 555 kilos of Zyklon B, one for Auschwitz and the other for Oranienburg.

The next day, January 31, 1946, in such a form that no one could doubt its authenticity and its admission into evidence by the Tribunal, newspapers all over the world reproduced this document which was not allowed to be read at the hearing the day before. It was this "press offensive" that started the exploitation of this document, which has continued for fifteen years by those eminent historians from the *Ecole Normale Supérieure, de la Rue de la Liberation* (sic), founded by Father Loriquet, such as Mr. Poliakov (*Le Bréviaire de la Haine* -- what a nice title!) and a few others like the Germans H. Krausnick (*Documentation sur l'extermination par les gaz*), J.J. Heydecker and J. Leeb (*Les Procès de Nuremberg*), and Gerhardt Schoenberger (*L'Etoile Jaune*), among others.

As much as one can gather from the writings of these brilliant historians, Kurt Gerstein was a chemical engineer. In 1938 he was arrested by the *Gestapo* and was interned in the concentration camp at Welzheim. How he managed to get out we do not know. In any case, we find him again in 1941 in the political S.S. and in 1942 in the *Waffen S.S.*, with the rank of *Obersturmführer* in the "hygiene division" (*Abteilung der Entwesung und der Entseuchung*) of the Central Sanitation Service (*Hauptamt des Sanitätsdienst*). In this capacity it was his business to receive the orders for Zyklon B, a chemical that was used as an insecticide by the *Reichswehr*, since 1924, and then by the *Wehrmacht*, which was not fortunate enough to know about DDT. These purchase orders he passed on along with a request for delivery, to the chemical works of DEGESCH Gesellschaft of Frankfurt/M. or to its subsidiary, Testa of Hamburg. And, naturally, when he received the disinfectant he got invoices.

The facts that he tells about -- or to be more correct -- which are found in the account that is attributed to him -- belong in 1942. So, on the 8th of June he met in his office with S.S. *Sturmführer* Gunther who said he urgently needed 100 kilos of Zyklon B to be delivered to a place which was known only to the driver of the truck.

A few weeks later, the driver of the truck in question presented himself; he was accompanied by Gunther. They loaded the 100 kilos of Zyklon B in the truck, Gerstein got in, and they drove off for Prague and then for Lublin where they arrived on the 17th of August. On the same day, they met *Gruppenführer* Globocnik, who is charged with the extermination of Jews in Warthegau and who has not found any better way to carry out his task than by using the exhaust gas from Diesel motors, which he has arranged to have piped into rooms especially fixed up for the purpose.

Naturally, the *Gruppenführer*, who has a sense of logic, starts by talking to Gerstein and detailing the scope of his entire operation. In his region there are three installations for exterminating Jews with diesel fumes: Belzec (on the route from Lublin to Lwow) with a capacity of 15,000 persons a day; Sobibor (he is not sure just where that is!), with a capacity of 20,000 per day; Treblinka (120 kilometers NNE of Warsaw), with no indication as to capacity according to Mr. Poliakov, but Heydecker and Leeb are more precise and give the figure of 20,000 per day. (This remarkable document does not speak the same language to one and the other!) A fourth

installation, Majdanek, is in preparation, but nothing is said by anyone about where it is or what its capacity was anticipated to be. To be thorough about this, we must add that in *L'Etoile Jaune* (German ed.), by Mr. Gerhardt Schoenberner, this part of the document not given; doubtless, it is an example of another sort of historical method. In citing the four locations, nevertheless, Mr. Gerhardt Schoenberner attributes to Gerstein's pen a total capacity of 9,000 persons per day for the four installations.

From *Le Bréviaire de la Haine* of Mr. Poliakov and the *Documentation sur l'extermination par les gaz* by Mr. Krausnick, we deduce in addition that the *Fuehrer* was at Lublin two days before (apparently, they do not shrink at anything in these factories where historical forgeries are fabricated!) with Himmler, and that they gave the order to "speed everything up." But this part of the document is not reproduced in either *L'Etoile Jaune* by Schoenberner, or the *Procès de Nuremberg* by Heydecker and Leeb.

Finally, Globocnik -- but only according to these two authors -- informs Kurt Gerstein of his mission to improve the gas chambers, particularly with the use of a more poisonous gas and less complicated mechanisms. Then, the men part company, after deciding to go to Belzec the next day.

And, after having repeated all that he was told, Gerstein recounts what he saw. Upon arriving at Belzec on August 18th, Mr. Kurt Gerstein began by visiting the camp under the guidance of a person that Globocnik put at his disposal. Mr. Poliakov was not able to read the name of this person. But after working at it, he thought he could make out "Wirth." More fortunate than he, Mr. Schoenberner was able to read clearly "S.S.-Hauptsturmführer Obermeyer von Pirmasens." Unfortunately, when the latter speaks of S.S. Wirth, who is quite another person than the one mentioned by Mr. Poliakov, he gives him the rank of "*Hauptmann*," a grade that never existed in the S.S!

In any case, during this visit Gerstein saw gas chambers in action using Diesel exhaust, and he measured the places: 5x5 or 25 square meters in area; 1.90 meters in height or 45 cubic meters, he calculated. We will say nothing about his 2.5 cubic meter error. Messrs. Krausnick, Heydecker, Leeb, and Schoenberner did not say anything about it either. More concerned about what was probable, Mr. Poliakov corrected the document (as we have had the honor to tell you!). He calculated that the chambers were 93 square meters in area (*Bréviaire de la Haine*, p. 223, 2nd ed.), without any further details, and that figure was more prudent. But, in the *Procès de Jerusalem* (Paris, 1962) when the Tribunal admits into evidence the 25 square meter version, Mr. Poliakov is not at all put out, and agrees with that figure, too. How right he was to correct the document! Later on, Kurt Gerstein recounts, as factual, that the next day, August 19th, he saw the gas chambers -- four according to some; ten, protest the others -- in action.

At the crack of dawn, a trainload of Jews arrived from Lemberg at the Belzec station, on the very edge of the camp, composed of 6,700 -- Mr. Poliakov gives 6,000 -- men, women and children, who were crammed into 45 cars (therefore, between 148-150 people per car, and, for those who know the size of Polish freight cars, quite a figure). It is certain that with its 6,000 to 6,700 people, this train of 45 cars was the most nightmarish of all deportee trains. Please recall that Dr. Miklos Nyiszli did not dare to

give more than "about 5,000 persons per train." This Kurt Gerstein certainly has no eye for estimating or measuring, and for an engineer that is not very good.

Two hundred Ukrainians, with whips in hand, hurl themselves at the train doors, tear them open (i.e., actually rip them off of the cars!) and make everyone get out, under the surveillance of other Ukrainians, with loaded guns in hand. "Captain of the S.S. " Wirth directs the operation, assisted by a few of his fellow S.S.: the prisoners are forced to undress completely, to turn in their valuables, to have their hair cut off; then, they are taken to the gas chambers.

"The rooms are filling. Everyone squeeze closer, ordered Captain Wirth. Many people were standing on the tips of their toes, 700 to 800 in an area 25 meters square, and 45 cubic meters. The S.S. pack the room as full as they can. The doors are closed." relates Mr. Schoenberger in *L'Etoile Jaune*, and, except in style, the others say the same thing, except for Poliakov, who sticks to his 93 square meter area.

The point on which everyone agrees, on the other hand, is the duration of the operation, measured by Gerstein, chronometer in hand. First the 700 to 800 persons who are jammed into the gas chambers had to wait two hours and forty-nine minutes before the diesel motor would run; then, it took thirty-two minutes for everyone to die. These times come from Gerstein who clocked them with his chronometer in hand, I repeat.

It was this fantastically gruesome account that Mr. Dubost -- not just anyone, but a prosecutor, and, doubtless, a well known one too, since he was chosen from among his peers to represent France at Nuremberg -- wanted to have accepted by the International Tribunal on January 30, 1946. The Tribunal did not go along. But, one must say that for the Tribunal not to go along it had to be really a little thick, because in other circumstances it swallowed, apparently without the flick of an eyelash, lots of other tricky things of this kind. This refusal of the Tribunal to consider the evidence did not keep the world press from issuing, the next day, January 31, 1946, *ad nauseam* and to cry yourself to sleep, the Kurt Gerstein story as an unquestionably authentic document. And, even today -- fifteen years later -- men who lay claim to the title of historian still dare to present it as unquestionably authentic in their books. Nor, by doing so, do they lose prestige or the favor of the world press. This reality was demonstrated at the Eichmann Trial. And, as we have mentioned above, the story has recently been staged in Germany by an actor of sorts, on a text written by Rolf Hochhuth, who obviously is seeking literary publicity by the presentation of a shocking subject matter.

In the Eichmann Trial, the Kurt Gerstein account was presented by the public prosecutor as being one of a "series of depositions given by Gerstein before various Allied officers." The judgment at Jerusalem did not refer to that series of depositions, and they were never made public. It seems that we do not know all that there is to know about the Gerstein dossier. Why? I am afraid that the answer to that question lies in this one little fact: in the article by Hans Rothfels (*op. cit.*) we find him writing that "*so fehlt insbesondere die im franzoesischen Text eingefuegte verallgemeinernde und sehr uebertreibende Schaetzung der Gesamtzahl an Opfern*" (p. 179), and in a note (p. 180) "*G. schaezt hier auf 25 millionen (Nicht nur Juden, sondern vorzugsweise Polen und Tschechen).*" The preceding sentences translate as follows:

"Thus is lacking in particular the generalized and very exaggerated estimation of the total number of victims inserted in the French text. G. estimates here 25 million (not only Jews, but especially Poles and Czechs)." It really was a little unbelievable. What is astonishing is the fact that those who made use of this singular document did not discover that gas chambers 25 meters square with a capacity of 700 to 800 persons was an even more shocking exaggeration. This oversight reveals quite a lot about their intellectual faculties as distinguished "Professors." Only those statements of Kurt Gerstein that were considered "objective" (*sachlich*, Mr. Rothfels says, p. 179) and, therefore, true, were made public and used at the tribunals. Another case of testimony that has been tampered with.

In the case of the Hochhuth play, we have only to point out the sources which he leans on for the authenticity of all the assertions in the Gerstein document as it was made known to the public, especially the assertion that "700 to 800 persons [were] asphyxiated" in gas chambers whose "floor area [was] 25 square meters." Among these sources there figures, naturally, Pastor Martin Niemöller (and, we have seen what his testimony concerning Dachau was worth), a certain Professor Golo Mann (who attests to gas chamber exterminations at Mauthausen from 1942 on), and various other persons of about the same including even Bishop Otto Dibelius, who I held in esteem until then as having much greater discernment; various newspaper articles by unqualified people and numerous rumors round out Hochhuth's source material.

All this passes understanding. It is true that one should be astonished at nothing: at that Eichmann trial the judges accepted as truth, for days on end, the statements of people who saw -- with their own eyes -- the gas chambers at Bergen-Belsen working, which even the *Institut für Zeitgeschichte* at Munich, that model of world resistantialism, admitted as having never existed.

Without doubt as a worthy counterpart to the *Stellvertreter* of the aforesaid Rolf Hochhuth there has just been brought out in France the *Tragédie de la déportation* in which, endorsed by Mrs. Olga Wormser and Mr. Henri Michel, even people like Mademoiselle Genevieve de Gaulle and the gentle Germaine Tillion come forward to reaffirm the existence of gas chambers and the systematic extermination by that means in one or the other of those camps where the *Institut für Zeitgeschichte* says that they did not exist.

Every day, with pen quivering with indignation, the press wonders at the resurgence of Nazism, racism, and anti-Semitism -- among which, however, they draw no distinctions. What makes me wonder is why the text tamperings of Mr. Poliakov and the others have so far not injected even more poison into the racism and the anti-Semitism which are aimed against the Jews. Nothing has been overlooked that would lead to that effect .

We know that Kurt Gerstein was an engineer, and, as such, he probably had a logical mind and probably was trained to make careful and accurate observations. Consequently, if it is true that he made the statement of which we have just read the resume (4), this man was obviously not, or was no longer, in possession of all his faculties when he did so. It is of interest to find out why. On this point, the clues we have about the circumstances of his death are to me very revealing. If we are to believe Hans Rothfels (*op. cit.* p. 185, note 25), the widow Gerstein was informed that

he had hanged himself, with the following notice: "...Death was due to hanging. This manner of killing oneself can absolutely not be prevented in a prison." That may be true, but it is no reason for not telling her when the event took place or what was done with the body; and, the fact that the authorities professed ignorance on both scores seems to me to explain a lot of things.

Suppose, for instance, that the two military inquisitors -- a Major D.C. Evans and a J.W. Haught -- who were said to have started the interrogation of Kurt Gerstein, found themselves in the presence of a man who, at the time they confronted him, had not yet written anything, or, between the date of his arrest and his first interrogation, had written only what he had actually seen, which would have been horrible enough, knowing the savage character of the war in the East on both sides. To read the memoirs of all those who were arrested in Germany at this time, and under these conditions, that is generally what happened to them. They were invited by those who had arrested them to write their confessions; so, this is not an entirely gratuitous supposition. Whether Kurt Gerstein wrote his confession in French or in German is not important. It is possible that he wrote them in both languages -- at least, so they say. Let us suppose again, and this is not entirely gratuitous, either, given the ways of the military and the police, that after the French version was written they attempted to force him to say what is in the document which bears his name, but which represented their view at the moment of the events in question; on the Allies' side, concentration Camps, gas chambers and "genocide" were in general the central theme of the anti-German propaganda, and being familiar with the intellectual level of the military and the police in all countries of the world, it would not be astonishing if that view represented their profession of faith. They might, themselves, have gone on to the editing of the French text, which was then presented to Kurt Gerstein for his signature; at the same time they could have asked him to write a few lines at the end of the last page to make its authenticity positive. One can imagine the scene -- Kurt Gerstein -- an engineer, and a man who was a precise thinker refusing to countersign and to authenticate all of those technical impossibilities which do not stand examination, and the two inquisitors giving him the beating that was usual in such cases. They were pretty brutal with him, no doubt, since Kurt Gerstein was usually described as a man who could not be pushed without resisting into saying what he did not want to say. Later, we can imagine the same scene for the German text, which lasts much longer but takes place in the same manner. The German text was written on a typewriter with a handwritten endorsement, but was not signed. Another detail must be noted: the handwritten endorsement is shorter, and the formula of certification under oath which occurs in the French text is missing. So, my conclusion is that Kurt Gerstein was beaten unconscious, and then he died before getting to the oath and the signature

Everything now becomes very clear. Since he died during the interrogation at Rottweil (in Germany) as a result of the torture inflicted on him to obtain his confession, Kurt Gerstein could never have been transferred to Paris to be put at the disposal of the *Sécurité Militaire*. This imaginary transfer would not have been thought up in the first place, unless a simple examination would have shown to the naked eye the real causes of his death. By spiriting away his corpse, an autopsy was avoided and, thus, the inevitable subsequent scandal was also avoided. This hypothesis would explain, furthermore, how the Americans came to let the document that bears his signature lie undisturbed in the archives of their delegation at

Nuremberg where Prosecutor Dubost found it. It is easy to understand, under such circumstances, why they had no desire to bring this body up to the surface by producing his so-called confession before the Nuremberg court. By rejecting it as not probative and by preventing Mr. Dubost from even reading it, the President of the hearing of January 30, 1946, knew very well what he was doing. But, Mr. Dubost, who had come so close to making a blunder, had given it out to the press. From then on, it could not be retracted, and its authenticity had to be sustained in order not to lose face before public opinion, which was thus already alerted.

There are only three other possible hypotheses:

First, at Rottweil, interrogated as Kurt Gerstein must have been to get a confession from him so manifestly out of line with the technical truths, he could have thought that the Americans would have him confirm the confession at the bar of some tribunal, at which time he could retract it and tell how it had been forced from him; however, foreseeing how he would be handled most likely by the ones thus exposed, in a moment of depression, he wanted to end his life quicker, suffer less, and, thus, committed suicide. Then, the body had to disappear so as not to reveal the marks it carried;

Second, he was actually transferred to Paris, where, to make him confess more, he was tortured again as he had been at Rottweil, and, for the same reason, he committed suicide; and, again, for the same reason the body had to disappear;

Third, either at Rottweil or at Paris, thinking that they could not get any more out of him than what he had said, or to avoid having him retract it in court, those who interrogated him murdered him in cold blood so that his supposed testimony could be presented by the prosecution without any risk of being contradicted by its author; in this latter case, it was still necessary to get rid of the body in view of the state that it was in, a condition which would have controverted the contention of suicide.

I maintain that the most plausible of these four hypotheses is the first. And, I maintain this opinion for the following reason: In July 1945, all of the French administrative services were in operation again, if not yet perfectly at least normally, and in all of the military or civil prisons, the prison registers were kept up to date. Therefore, one of two things must have happened: either the name of Kurt Gerstein occurs on the register of one of the prisons in the column "entered on..."; the column "released on..." is blank, and the "observations" column records his death, the person or group to which his body was turned over, and the place where he was buried. Or else, which is the case, there is no notation for Kurt Gerstein, which means that he was never imprisoned in any military or civil prison in Paris. That fact would indicate that, if he left Rottweil for Paris, he never arrived. Was he assassinated en route? It is possible. In any case, the most precise of all those who have told us where he committed suicide is the always incredible Rothfels who writes:

Gerstein was then [after his arrest] put on his honor for the time being by the French occupation forces, with permission to go back and forth between Tubingen [where his family lived] and Rottweil. Then he was brought to a prison in Paris [at what date he does not tell us]. There on July 25, 1945, in the "military prison of Paris" he committed suicide. (*op. cit.* p. 185)

Aside from the freedom of movement that was allowed this prisoner while he was still at Rottweil, and which in itself should not cause the slightest surprise, the most curious thing in this statement is that he killed himself in "the military prison of Paris." In Paris there is not *one*, but *several* military prisons, each one being administratively designated by its own name, the most famous of which is the "*Prison militaire du Cherche Midi*." In 1945, given the extraordinary number of people, both military and civil, who were incarcerated, there were "military divisions," in addition, at la Santé, Fresnes, and other places. The official paper which mentions the death of Gerstein could only have as its letterhead: "Military Subdivision of Paris -- Military Prison of Cherche-Midi," or of Fort Montrouge, or of Caserne Neuilly, etc., or "Penitentiary Administration -- Prison de la Santé, (or Fresnes) Military Division." Depending on the administration which issued the communication, it could also, of course, have had other headings. For instance, the heading could have been "Sécurité militaire" or "Sûreté Générale;" but in no case could it have been "military prison of Paris." And if, in spite of this, it has this heading and if an official statement with another stamp gave notice of the death of Gerstein only in these terms and in quotation marks, then it is just a forgery that was prepared for the occasion by someone who knew nothing about the French police services, or about the French safety, intelligence, military and civil administrations. In short, it is a clumsy forgery - another one!

Finally, the preceding discussion which has led us to the discovery of a forgery until now unnoticed, explains why the statements that are imputed to Kurt Gerstein seem to be those of a man who was not in possession of all his faculties: at the moment when they were given to him for his signature he was already on the point of death because of the methods that had been used to extract them from him, and he only had time to sign the French version before dying. The very form of the French version, as reproduced in Exhibit No. 124 at the Jerusalem trial, militates in favor of this contention. To my French eyes, which claim to know the maternal language fairly well, it looks much more like French written by an American (or an Englishman) rather than French written by a German. I would not be surprised if, when the day comes when this document can be examined, specialists discover that it was typed on an English or American machine, since, judging by its tenor, the intellectual level of those who wanted to make Kurt Gerstein endorse it seems to have been so low that they probably did not think it indispensable to type it out on a German or French machine. As it is, it would not be very bold to ask oneself if the handwritten notes on the French version are really in Kurt Gerstein's writing.

The value that can be placed on the Gerstein document having been assessed, what now must be done is to consider the value that Mr. Raul Hilberg placed on the document. I shall say right now that for once Mr. Raul Hilberg is very prudent. He devotes only three pages to the subject (pp. 570-572), and those pages mention, in passing, that Gerstein was present at "a gassing which took an especially long time" and that "to Wirth's great embarrassment and mortification [he] timed the operation with a stop watch." However, nothing is said about the size of the gas chambers or about the figures concerning the extent of the exterminations by gas. The invoices for Zyklon B, which are appended to the document, are mentioned too. Here, I must point out that, basing himself on these invoices (12 of them according to Rothfels *op. cit.* p. 179; two, claimed by Prosecutor Dubost at the Trial of the Major War Criminals, with one for Oranienburg and the other for Auschwitz) and those invoices which were

produced in the court of the Tribunal which in 1949 judged the DEGESCH Gesellschaft, producer of Zyklon B, Mr. Raul Hilberg calculates (P. 570) that the amounts of this product which were delivered in 1943 and 1944 by this company to the German Army, were 160 tons, and to the sanitation services of the SS were 125 tons (12 for Auschwitz in 1943, none in 1944, but 7.5 tons in 1942). In the aggregate these figures seem plausible to me; in any case, they seem Proportionate -- but in the aggregate only. If from 1942 to the end of the war, the German Army ordered and had delivered 160 tons of Zyklon B, it is quite possible, judging by their needs in the face of the exigencies of the first Russian campaign during 1941, that the sanitary services of the SS would later have required 125 tons. But, in detail I am much more cautious, and the shipments to Auschwitz particularly distress me. In the 12 invoices that were appended to the Gerstein document, bearing dates between the 14th of February and the 31st of May 1944, there were indeed some that pertained to Auschwitz, as Messrs. Dubost and Rothfels have told us. However, of these dates none are given in Mr. Raul Hilberg's calculation. And, the absence of dates make the exactness of his calculations awkward to follow.

Since I am not a specialist in the use of Zyklon B for hygienic purposes, I am not in a position to give a definitive analysis of the significance of an all-inclusive delivery to Auschwitz of 19.5 tons of Zyklon B, allowing for the fact that a greater amount was delivered, since Mr. Raul Hilberg forgot to include the deliveries of 1944 in his calculations. However, even if I were such an expert, quite a number of factors that would be needed to shape an estimate would be lacking. Therefore, this is all that I can say:

1. Just the fact that the Zyklon B was delivered to a concentration camp does not permit one to conclude that it was used to asphyxiate the prisoners; otherwise, one must conclude that it was similarly used in other camps where it was delivered but where no extermination of that kind has been shown;
2. Auschwitz was a *Stammlager* (central camp) which means that there were more *Kommandos* stationed around there than, I suspect but cannot however confirm, were located, at Chelmno, Belzec, Majdanek, Sobibor and Treblinka. This figure for total delivery is then not just for the Auschwitz camp, but all those *Kommandos* around the camp, a list of which, as far as I know, has never been made known;
3. In order to estimate the consumption of Zyklon B correctly, we would have to know how many tons of this overall total were used and how many were not, how many persons went through the camp, and how many kilos of Zyklon B were required to disinfect their clothing on their arrival at the rate of 1,500 to 2,000 persons per convoy. Then, we would have to know how much Zyklon B was used for the minimum disinfection of underclothing necessary for the total population of the camp, and for the *Kommandos*, every fifteen days. Even if we find out someday about how many persons were involved and about how many tons of Zyklon B were required, we still shall not know how many tons were effectively used, because we shall never know, there having been no inventory, how many were not used. And, so we shall never be able to make a comparison which would allow us to say whether much more Zyklon B was used than was required for disinfection --in which case one might speak of exterminations using this material. And, this means that we have to keep searching until we find other methods of assessment;

4. Was all of the Zyklon B that was delivered to Auschwitz used? If so, then we would have proof that more was used than was reasonable, and we would have to concede the point, but that possibility is excluded. All the camps were abundantly supplied with this product, and I shall give but one example of it: the train in which I was evacuated from Dora, which left the camp at the last minute, and which I left and then got on again under circumstances which I have described in an earlier chapter, included a car three-quarters full of iron bound boxes with labels all over them: some of the labels bore "*Blausäure*" (Prussic acid) on a red background while the others had "*Vorsicht*" (danger) on a white background. Below the "*Vorsicht*" there were some lines which I did not read. I had more things to worry about than stuff that was labeled dangerous. I was looking for a bag and shoes which obviously were not to be found there, and I was not interested. Moreover, I was far from being able to surmise what the *Blausäure* was to be used for. It was much, much later, after I read Kogon, that I put two and two together. But, I only wanted to say that there is no reason for not thinking that the other camps, and especially Auschwitz, were just as abundantly supplied as Dora and that the total amount of Zyklon B delivered to Auschwitz was no more used up than was that which had been delivered to Dora. And here we are once again faced with the unanswerable question: how much of it was used?

If this question cannot be answered, one might as well say that no significance can be attributed to the deliveries of Zyklon B that were made to Auschwitz which are laid out so complacently -- and, alas, so incompletely -- by Mr. Raul Hilberg, except that this product was, by definition, not a man-killer, but an insecticide and a disinfectant and was used as such since 1924 by all the German Military and civil health services (5). The invoices produced, in any case, are not grounds for going beyond this statement itself without foundering in suppositions and conjectures, all of which are absolutely, indisputably, and shockingly gratuitous. What we have just seen on this point provides it only too well.

Mr. Raul Hilberg was well inspired not to retain either the description of extermination by gas, as the Gerstein document says its author witnessed (Remember: 700 to 800 persons in a room 25 meters square in area!), or the statistics concerning the Belzec, Treblinka and Sobibor camps. At least he avoided the misadventure of that poor Mr. Rothfels.

Let us recall, too, the statistics as they occur in the German text (in the French text given by Mr. Poliakov in the *Bréviaire de la Haine* they are not the same, and, doubtless, for the same reasons that Mr. Raul Hilberg, and the Jerusalem court, did not use them) which were made public following the article by Mr. Rothfels (*op. cit.* pp. 187-194), and according to which the extermination capacity of the camps was the following:

Belzec:.....15,000 persons a day;
Treblinka:.....25,000 persons a day;
Sobibor:.....20,000 persons a day.

About that, Mr. Rothfels wrote (*op. cit.* p. 181) that "600,000 having perished at Belzec, Gerstein's estimate of 15,000 per day is not plausible" (von 15, 000 pro Tag nichts unwahrscheinliches). This camp officially began exterminating in March 1942, and stopped in December of the same year (Poliakov, *op. cit.* p. 224), which makes

the duration of its operation some nine months or 270 days; 15,000 times 270 equals 4,050,000 persons and not 600,000.

Let us continue with this kind of reasoning: Treblinka and Sobibor were officially exterminating from March 1942 to "the autumn of 1943," about 18 months or 540 days. At the daily rate which is given in the preceding paragraph, we get an extermination total for the first of 13,500,000 persons and for the second of 10,800,000 persons. In all, for these three camps alone there must have been 28,350,000 persons exterminated. And, if we are to believe Mr. Gerstein, they were all Jews! Incidentally, this total does not count those exterminated by the same process at Chelmno, which the Gerstein document does not cite, and at Majdanek, which it cites as being "in preparation" at the time of his visit in August 1942, so he could not estimate its capacity.

And that is the sort of testimony that they have the audacity to present to us as being "reliable!" To complete the picture let us point out that, when they come to summing up and to giving the totals of Jewish losses in each of these camps, those who seriously offer this nonsense arrive at figures like the one Rothfels found for Belzec. Below is a table giving these losses as estimated by the Polish Commission on War Crimes (from Poliakov, *op cit.* p. 224), and Mr. Raul Hilberg (*op. cit.* p. 572):

Camps.	Estimate of Losses	Estimate of Losses
	Polish Commission	Raul Hilberg
Chelmno.	300,000...	"over a hundred thousand"
Belzec	600,000	"hundreds of thousands"
Sobibor	250,000	"hundreds of thousands"
Treblinka	700,000	"hundreds of thousands"
Majdanek	200,000	"tens of thousands"
TOTAL	2,050,000	950,000 (6)

One wonders just how the Warsaw Commission and Mr. Raul Hilberg came to these conclusions; there is no evidence that they referred to the Gerstein document, and neither one cites any other documentary references worthy of the name.

For Auschwitz, in the same table, Mr. Raul Hilberg gives one million dead, whereas to my knowledge no one else ever gave less than two million, (7) with most of the witnesses mentioning four. I do not think that I go too far in saying that if people who examine the same occurrence and who claim to be as qualified as the Polish Commission on War Crimes and as Mr. Raul Hilberg, Professor at the University of Vermont, can arrive at such disparate results as we have seen, it must be that their units of measure, or their bases of reference, are purely conjectural, do not rest on anything positive, and derive from different and extremely doubtful sources. The proof which supports my observation is furnished by the Polish Commission and Mr. Raul Hilberg themselves. I have before me at least one hundred of the references

which the Polish Commission turned to in order to arrive at figures for which it is responsible in the preceding table. Among these references, one finds such things as: *German Crimes in Poland* (Warsaw, 1948), which is a pack of contradictions by people of whom it cannot even be said that they existed and who are given as "survivors;" or, "Testimony of Dr. Rothbalsam (dead!)", gathered by Mme. Novitch;" or *Belzec*, (Cracow, 1946) which is a book of recollections on the camp, by someone named Reder, given as "sole survivor," about whom it was said at the Jerusalem trial (hearing of June 6, 1961) that he had been "dead since..."

As for Mr. Raul Hilberg, on almost every page of his book, one finds references, in footnotes, such as these: "Affidavit by Rudolf Schonberg, survivor" (p. 311, nt. 14), or "Borkomorowski, *The Secret Army*" (p. 315, nt. 32), or the testimony of an unnamed survivor taken by Cohen in "*Human Behaviour in the Concentration Camp*" (p. 625, nt. 22), or, again, another testimony, of another survivor, named this time but just as hypothetical, taken by a certain Friedman in his book, *Osviecim* (p. 622, nt. 8), etc...etc. And, in addition to personal testimony, there abound extracts from papers and documents which were written during the war or since its end. In the first case, they are papers published under German control. Bits of statistics are found in them that are not always in agreement; often these documents are annotated or evaluated by journalists who are not specialists; these documents and papers may discuss the steps that were taken to plunder, to ghettoize, or to concentrate; they may outline the bad treatment of which the Jews were victims, but *never* do they say anything whatsoever that could justify an interpretation in the sense of murder or extermination by gas or otherwise. The word "*Judenfrei*" often recurs, applied to a territory, a country or a region, but it means "freed of Jews," not their extermination as Mr. Raul Hilberg insinuates. In the second case, they are papers that were published after the war ended. One finds that these documents and papers, annotated by non-witnesses, contain accounts which were given by witnesses, who, for the most part are not named. If they are named, they generally are given as "dead since," thereby precluding the possibility of being cross-examined, in a controlled manner, by qualified persons.

How, indeed, could one possibly think that these witnesses are objective observers, people who, if they are still alive, will admit that since their release from the concentration camps, every move that they have made, and still make, in their lives is dictated by the hatred that they have forever sworn for the Germans? Quite a number of witnesses of this kind appeared before the Jerusalem court to testify that they had *seen* gas chambers in camps where, as is acknowledged by everyone including Jewish sources, none existed.

The basic shortcoming of this kind of testimony -- if one wants to obtain the truth -- is found in the fact that it was given by people who were not witnesses, in the sense of relating honestly what they actually saw, but who were demanding reparations -- as well as retribution -- for what they have suffered. Consequently, they had an interest in saying those things which were calculated by them to support their objective. In all of this extermination business there are mostly accusers, who back each other up, and forgeries, crudely fabricated, whose authenticity is verified only by false witnesses. And, like Mr. Rothfels when faced with the Gerstein document, Mr. Raul Hilberg, with a frightening lack of conscience and an unimaginable contempt for the most elementary rules of his profession, pretends not to have seen the existence of bias and

interest which undermines the credibility of his source material. And, here we are again back to the fundamental problem of our times: the extraordinary intellectual and moral prostration of the elites.

This latter observation is not addressed to the Commission for War Crimes of Warsaw, or, for example, to Madame Hannah Arendt; these two, from all evidence, do not belong to the elites. The first was created on the other side of the Iron Curtain, not to verify historical facts, but to produce evidence that can be used for certain kinds of propaganda. To take part in the Warsaw Commission it is not at all necessary to be a historian, but just a communist.

As for the second, Mme. Arendt is obviously a Zionist propagandist. Much of the data which she uses in her report of the Eichmann Trial (*The New Yorker*, *op. cit.*) derive from what she has read in the book by Mr. Raul Hilberg, which she assimilated badly, which she dishes back to us even more clumsily than the manner in which it was given in the first place, and which she cites with the clearest and most positive avowals. Mr. Robert Kempner, that former Prussian Police commissioner who is a much higher ranking agent of Zionism, is, moreover, not at all pleased with the manner in which she carried out her task. In *Aufbau* (Vol. XXIX, No. 15, April 12, 1963) he administered one of those blistering attacks which I recommend the reader to read. *Asinus asinam castiget*, the Romans of today would say of this shabby controversy.

To return to the Gerstein document and to finish with it, I now ask the following question: If it is not true that the gas chambers at Belzec, Treblinka, and Sobibor could asphyxiate between 15,000 and 25,000 persons a day; if it is not true that a gas chamber 25 meters square could hold 700 to 800 persons; if it is not true that a train with 45 cars could transport 6,700 persons; and if it is not true that Hitler was at Belzec on August 15, 1942, I ask what does it contain that is true, since it contains nothing else? Are the Zyklon B invoices that are appended to the document genuine? Perhaps, but they prove nothing.

Of all those who have endorsed the authenticity of this document, only one grieves me, Otto Dibelius, Bishop of Berlin, whose fine independent spirit and sureness of judgment I have drawn attention to, particularly with regard to the Nuremberg Trial. According to Mr. Rothfels, (*op. cit.* pp. 181-182) he wrote a letter to the *Institut für Zeitgeschichte* at Munich, dated November 22, 1949, in which, after a series of praises addressed to Gerstein, we find the following sentence: "Through it I was in a position to establish that Gerstein's communication to me, insofar as his Swedish acquaintance came into the question, had been absolutely according to the truth. So had also been his original report." Of Eugen Kogon, David Rousset, Golo Mann, Hans Rothfels, Hannah Arendt, Raul Hilberg, among others, I have made a special and individual study of each of them, and it does not seem that anything else could have been expected of them.

V. Conclusion

With regard to gas chambers, the almost endless procession of false witnesses and of falsified documents to which I have invited the reader's attention during this long study, proves, nevertheless, only one thing: never at any moment did the responsible

authorities of the Third Reich intend to order or in fact, order -- the extermination of the Jews in this or any other manner (8). Did such exterminations take place without orders? This question has haunted me for fifteen years, and it is the Gerstein document, the worst and most immoral forgery of all, that indirectly put me in a position finally to answer it in a positive way.

It was June 1963. The first and the second part of my *Le véritable procès Eichmann ou Les Vainqueurs incorrigibles* had just come out in German with the title *Zum Fall Eichmann* and the subtitle *Was ist Wahrheit? ... oder die unbelehrbaren Sieger*. (**) For fifteen years, every time that I heard of a witness anywhere, no matter where in the portion of Europe that was not occupied by the Soviets, who claimed to have himself been present at gas exterminations, I immediately went to him to get his testimony. And, each time the experience ended in the same way. With documentation in hand, I would ask him so many precise and detailed questions that soon it became apparent that he could not answer except by lying. Often his lies became so transparent, even to himself, that he ended his testimony by declaring that he had not seen it himself, but that one of his good friends, who had died in the camps and whose good faith he could not doubt, had told him about it. I covered thousands and thousands of kilometers throughout Europe in this way.

One day in the month of June 1963, I had a strange visitor, a German, who was large and of good carriage, who looked about sixty (but during our conversation I learned that he was actually much older) who had a little something military in his bearing, who was very distinguished in appearance, and who was exquisitely polite. In his hands was my first book on the subject, the German edition of *Mensonge d'Ulysse*, in which a book marker was sticking out.

He introduced himself and told me about the purpose of his visit, which he wanted kept absolutely confidential. I Promised to preserve that confidentiality, and that is why I have presented what was said in our conversation in such a way that he cannot be identified; the account of what he told me alone being authentic.

He did not want to have his name given because during the war he had been a high ranking civilian in an important government service. He had not been a military man, but was a professional within the civil service. He did not conceal from me, that, although he had not been an active National Socialist, he had, nevertheless, given his support to the Party in 1933. When the war was over, he had narrowly escaped being a defendant at Nuremberg. Although he had been "denazified" like everyone else, he had lost his former governmental position. He had suffered a great many difficulties, and he had had enough. He did not want to begin all that again. The story that he had been carrying around inside him for twenty years burdened him, but he was to be excused for the cowardice which had made him keep it to himself until the present. When the war ended, he had four children, all very young, and, at more than fifty, a whole new career to carve out.

I willingly and very sincerely conceded this. I understood the moral -- and often physical -- misery that millions and millions of Germans have lived through and still live with, and which reduced them to a silence that they only break when they vote periodically for Chancellor Adenauer, although his politics do not please them, but whom they consider the only German capable of protecting them a little against the

punitive measures of the German counterparts of Tomas de Torquemada, like Prosecutor-General Bauer.

These things said, and his conditions having been accepted by me, my interlocutor opened his copy of *Le Mensonge d'Ulysse* to the marked page, set it down in front of him, and without further preamble started right in.

"You say, and I believe you," he said in substance, "that not one of the witnesses who have claimed to have been present at exterminations by gas have, until now, been able to prove it to you. I have just read your last writings on the matter, and I feel that you are on the point of concluding that there were none. Seeing the interest that your works have aroused, I thought that it would be very dangerous, both for you and for Germany, if you do, since you could not fail to be discredited, a fate which you do not deserve. Moreover, if you were discredited, Germany, at the same time, would have lost her only defender who has some hearing. And, so I have come to tell you myself that I have been present at an extermination by gas..."

"Then I do not understand you," I answered. "It does not seem to me that if you told your story publicly that you would risk, as you claim, being imprisoned again. Witnesses of this kind are being sought by Prosecutor Bauer, who has so far not found anyone who is trustworthy, and if you are sure of yourself, go to him; he will lay down the red carpet..."

"Be patient," he interrupted, "In Germany in order not to be thrown into prison, it is not enough to state that one has witnessed an extermination by gas. It has to be told exactly as it was described in a document or by a witness officially recognized as reliable, and that is not my case. You will see. I was on an official trip to Lublin, and I had just gone in to see Globocnik when Gerstein was announced. Chance had it that I found myself again with him the next day at Belzec. And, if I say that I also was present at the extermination that is referred to in the document which is attributed to him, I must also add that everything said in it concerning the gassing operation, as well as the circumstances under which he was present and his conversation with Globocnik, is, from one end to the other, utterly false. Without any doubt, such testimony on my part would be enough to have me thrown automatically and immediately into prison."

I understood less and less. "If everything is false from beginning to end," I ventured, "there was, therefore, no extermination . . ." "There was one all right," he said. "But let us begin at the beginning." And, then, he told the story ... From his long recital, which I have abridged in order to stick to the essentials, it turned out that:

1. In the conversation that he had at Lublin with Gerstein, in the presence of my visitor and two or three military men whose names my visitor only remembered because they are given in the Gerstein document, Globocnik had spoken only of Belzec and absolutely had not mentioned any other camps. Concerning the number of persons that could be exterminated at the Belzec installation, not one figure was given. Furthermore, he did not begin the conversation by talking of extermination; he talked only of the disinfecting of clothing. It was only further into the conversation that, while deploring the limited means for disinfection available at Belzec, he said, in passing that he had found a very efficient method which would permanently resolve

the Jewish question. When inquiry was made by my visitor as to what he meant, he described his Diesel engine at Belzec... "But," declared Globocnik, "it is only a makeshift installation; what I need is a more deadly gas, which is easier to use. That is why I have sent Gunther to get from Gerstein those things that are better adapted to do this job."

"I was horrified," my visitor said to me. "Because of my civilian position, I was the only one listening to Globocnik who could say anything. 'But after all,' I said to him, 'it is a crime, and are you sure that that is the solution that the *Fuehrer* has in mind for the Jewish problem?' 'Certainly I am sure,' was all that Globocnik answered, shrugging his shoulders. And, with a knowing look, but without saying it precisely, he suggested that the authority for his project came from the *Fuehrer* himself. Moreover, he insisted that it must be kept secret. Unlike what is said in the Gerstein document, he did not state that Himmler and Hitler had been to Lublin two days before -- that is pure invention."

2. During the conversation, my visitor remarked that Globocnik had said that he had sent Gunther to Gerstein to get a more poisonous gas and less complicated apparatus. My visitor had noted that this was not the normal operating procedure, and he had wondered why Globocnik had not addressed himself directly to the supply office by letter. This fact made my visitor suspicious about the entire operation. My visitor said that Globocnik's assignment at Warthegau was a punitive measure that had been imposed for a number of misdeeds which he had committed during his tenure as *Gauleiter* in the Vienna area. At Berlin he also had a very bad reputation, at least, so my visitor claimed. Thus, with the intention of speaking about this business as soon as he got back to Berlin, my visitor decided to go to Belzec -- even though his business did not require him to go -- so as to be in a position to speak about the matter with some first hand knowledge.

At Belzec he saw a very small camp, with enough barracks to have housed four or five hundred people. He saw the inmates walking around the camp and they appeared to be well fed and in good shape. Moreover, upon inquiry he learned that they were all Jews. He was told by a Jewish inmate that there was a small railway station with a single track that served the camp. From time to time, a short train would arrive full of his coreligionists. The people in the camp were to greet the arrivals and were to assist in their extermination by herding them into a little house, which was shown him, where they were asphyxiated. On the house was a sign which read "*Fondation Heckenholt*," the name of the Jew who was in charge of starting and keeping the motor running. The inmate told all this while eating a jam tart, which clouds of flies tried to settle on and which he kept brushing away. A disgusting smell similar to that of a freshly opened grave pervaded the camp. The flies and the stench came from the massive pits where the victims were buried after each gassing. *Hauptsturmführer* Wirth, formerly an officer with the Stuttgart criminal police and commandant of this camp, received my interlocutor on his arrival. He and another S.S. officer, his deputy, who accompanied them during his visit, both complained incessantly about the *Kommando* to which they had been assigned. They begged him to use his influence to get them transferred to another unit as soon as he returned to Berlin. Neither one of them could understand how they could be required to do such work, and they were sure that at Berlin nothing was known about what was going on here. "Why do you not ask for a transfer yourselves?" asked my visitor. "Then, after getting it you could

expose this disgraceful business..." "This is just what Globocnik is afraid of," he was told. "And another thing, we could not apply for a transfer without going through channels, and that means going through him, and for fear of being exposed, either he would not grant it, or he would have us shot at once on some pretext or other. We know of cases... Fortunately you have come here and you can, at the same time that you get us out of here through your connections in Berlin, stop this shameful business... Fortunately, too, it is only a small train with few cars that arrives from time to time, two or three up to now (9). Otherwise, with the limited means we have at hand for burying the bodies, we would be living in a regular center of infection, breeding every imaginable disease... Tomorrow a train is scheduled to arrive at about seven in the morning..."

3. My interlocutor told me that, upon being informed of the expected train, he decided to stay. Accompanied by Wirth and his S.S. aide, he again visited the little house that had been fixed up for exterminations, and he described it to me. It had a raised ground floor, and a hallway with three small rooms on each side, which he did not measure, but which he thought had an area of surely less than 5 x 5 meters, perhaps 4 x 5 maximum, and all of them were rectangular, not square. At the end of the hall was the room where the Diesel motor was located in the center on a cement base and a little below floor level. I asked about this motor and how it was connected up to exhaust outlets in each of the six rooms. It was a truck motor, about 1.50 meters long, a little less than 1 meter wide, and a good meter in height, including the concrete base. Its power he did not know; perhaps it had 200 horsepower, he said. I pointed out to him that it was said to have been a marine engine, and, therefore, it must have been much bigger if it had been built for a ship. "Surely not," he said. "it was a truck motor, at least its dimensions led me to visualize it on a truck." He remembered the number of cylinders, six in one row. As for the connection with the exhaust pipes, in order to proceed faster, he made a drawing for me, which showed that the motor exhaust was introduced into each room by means of a pipe that was connected to an outlet in the floor. "I do not wonder," I said, "that Globocnik wanted to find a more efficient method. It must have been horribly long..." "A quarter of an hour," he interrupted.

If until now this account had seemed plausible to me, after this remark, this "quarter of an hour" weighed heavily on the rest of our conversation. We talked about it at length, and we kept returning to it, with me maintaining that it was absolutely impossible and with him insisting that it was nevertheless true. I had already studied the Gerstein document together with automotive engineers and toxicologists and I knew what I was talking about. In response to my technical objections, he said that he had seen it and that "nevertheless it was true." In vain I tried to explain to him that, with 200 horsepower or even more, a Diesel engine could not produce, in a quarter of an hour, the necessary toxic concentration in 250 to 300 cubic meters of air to cause death. That faced with the impossibility of getting 700 to 800 persons -- 40 to 50 at a maximum, my interlocutor corrected -- into rooms of 40 to 45 cubic meters, and knowing the limitations of a Diesel engine, the writer of the document had to reduce to almost nothing the quantity of air to be made toxic. I added that the atmosphere in the house in question would not be sufficiently toxic to kill everyone until after 32 minutes and that if the day before Globocnik had said himself that the method was not very efficient, it was just another proof that the operation must have lasted a long time. Finally, I pointed out that after twenty years his memory could not be so exact, etc. Nothing budged him. He would not change his mind about the quarter of an hour,

except to say that he had not timed it with his watch and that without doubt his estimate was within a minute or two of being exact. Moreover, his demeanor reflected only good faith. Since then I have, with his sketch in hand, questioned many experts on combustion engines, fluid combustion, and toxicology, no one has been willing to give less than one and a half to two hours

During the rest of the conversation, nothing else came up that I took exception to, but this objection is an important one and is very disturbing. There was one other thing that was strange about the asphyxiating apparatus. I did not understand why the designer had divided the space into six rooms instead of leaving it in one, which would have been less costly and less complicated; but, I did not press the point.

4. Meanwhile, Gerstein arrived with three or four people; my visitor was no longer quite sure how many. Globocnik, who had come with them, turned right around and went back. During his conversation the day before with Globocnik, my visitor reported that Gerstein had related that his trip from Berlin to Lublin had not been uneventful. What he had with him was not Zyklon B in crystals, as one might think, but liquid prussic acid in bottles, and with the incessant jolting on a road in bad repair, one or two of these bottles had broken in the truck. He and his driver had been very frightened. My visitor then asked him how his trip from Lublin to Belzec had been. "Very good," he replied. "We left the goods at Lublin..."

They inspected the camp together, and in the evening, still together, they were served at dinner by a couple of Jewish prisoners. The atmosphere was heavy; the most talkative one was Gerstein. He seemed keyed up, and everything he said seemed to be aimed at belittling Globocnik. He inspired confidence in no one, at least my interlocutor had that impression. And, when he heard several years later, from one of his friends who had had Gerstein as a student, that the latter was a psychopath, he was not surprised.

The next morning, between 7 and 8 o'clock, the expected transport of Jews arrived; it was a train of four or five cars, with some 250 to 300 men, women, and children, and not with 6,000 or 6,700 persons, piled into 45 cars, as the Gerstein Document claims. Likewise, the 200 Ukrainians that are mentioned in the Document were in reality about two dozen Jewish inmates from the camp. There was no brutality; no doors were wrenched from the cars; no one was struck with rubber truncheons. Rather, there was a brotherly reception from their coreligionists, plainly intent on creating a feeling of confidence in the arrivals.

In preparing the victims for the gassing, they were required to deposit their valuables and jewels at the *Effecktenkammer* in return for a receipt; then they proceeded to the barber. Finally, they were made to undress. The undressing was the longest process and took almost all morning. These unfortunates asked their coreligionists, who had received them under the armed guard of a few listless and inattentive S.S., what was to become of them. They were told that they were to be disinfected and that, after that, they would be assigned to labor *Kommandos* according to their abilities. They were told to take a deep breath during the disinfection process -- a hideous spectacle for those who knew.

Then, they were herded into the building where the gassing was to take place. Haphazardly they were divided up among the six rooms -- 40 to 50 per room, my visitor repeated. The doors were closed, and the lights were put out. At this moment, the only things to be heard were the prayers of these unfortunates, and the cries of fright from the women and the children. The engine was started and, a quarter of an hour later, the bodies were removed by the *Totenkommando*, which was composed of Jewish prisoners. The corpses were carried to a waiting grave.

"But that grave," I interrupted, "they must have seen it, since, really, for 250 to 300 people it must have been quite sizeable." My visitor replied, "No. It had been dug some distance behind the gassing house, and they could not see it. The bodies were taken out through side doors in each room, directly to the outside, sort of garage doors. The dimensions of the grave? I have an idea that it must have been about 20 meters long, 5 wide, and barely 2 deep..."

And, he explained the dangers of that kind of burial. Wirth had told him that into that huge grave lots of gasoline had been poured over the heap of corpses. But, the attempt to cremate the corpses in that manner had been only partially successful. Earth was thrown on top of the corpses, but after two or three days this earth raised up from the pressure of gas rising from below. And, it infected the air. Also, the rotting flesh attracted the clouds of those flies which one saw everywhere. Deciding that he now had seen enough, my visitor left the camp without delay and returned to Lublin.

I tried to return the conversation to a discussion of the "quarter of an hour" that the gassing was supposed to have lasted, by expressing the opinion that the length of the breakdown of the diesel engine, which lasted two hours and forty nine minutes, according to the Gerstein Document, could actually have been not a breakdown, but the added time that this engine required to poison the air sufficiently to cause death. I had no success with this suggestion. My visitor was sure that there had been not the least engine trouble and that the gassing took only a quarter of an hour.

My visitor's business in the region around Lublin took longer than he had anticipated. He was detained in Lodz for a good two weeks, and he could not get back to Berlin until about September 15. Immediately upon his return he went straight to Dr. Grawitz who was a friend of his and a close associate of *Reichsführer*-S.S. Heinrich Himmler. After hearing his tale, Dr. Grawitz jumped up, horrified, and rushed without delay to Himmler.

"I cannot now be specific about the dates," he added, "but about ten days later, Dr. Grawitz came himself to tell me, while at the same time congratulating me for my intervention, that an inquiry was underway about what I had reported, and, a few weeks later -- I remember that it was just a few days after All Saints Day -- that the camp had been closed and Globocnik once again had been transferred (10). That is all I know."

I told my visitor about Dr. Konrad Morgen's testimony at Nuremberg on the 7th and 8th of August 1945 (I.M.T., Volume XX, pp. 520-553). He knew about it and gave it no credit. The portrait that Morgen drew of Wirth, making him an unscrupulous criminal, corresponded in no way with what was the actual fact. Morgen had described him as being the commandant of four camps and the *Deus ex-machina* of

the whole business (*op. cit.* pp. 528-29), while, in reality, he was the despairing commandant of the Belzec camp only, and, furthermore, he was bullied and terrorized by Globocnik. Then again, Morgen had testified that he had met Wirth, and if he had met Wirth, it could only have been at Belzec. But, he gave the date of this meeting as "the end of 1943" (*op. cit.* p. 527), when the camp had been closed at the latest in December 1942. This Dr. Konrad Morgen was a man who had held the rank of *Obersturmbannführer* in the S.S., who had headed the criminal police office of the *Reich*, with special powers that had been conferred by Himmler himself, and who probably had many things on his conscience, my visitor concluded.

I had no difficulty sharing that view with him. Morgen had said that he had met Höss, as Commandant of the Auschwitz camp, "...towards the end of 1943, beginning of 1944" (*op. cit.*, p. 540), when Höss had not been in that post after the end of November 1943; Morgen placed all of the exterminations by gas at Monowitz (*op. cit.*, p. 540), when all witnesses have subsequently placed them at Birkenau; Morgen claimed that Wirth received his orders directly from Hitler's Chancellery (*op. cit.* p. 531), when, etc....

5. It was at this moment in our conversation that the eyes of my interlocutor fell on *Le Mensonge d'Ulysse* open before him, and to which until then he had not made any reference. "I have read your books," he continued; "In my opinion your critique of the testimonies and documents produced at Nuremberg is impeccable and will one day bear fruit. Thanks are due you. But what interests me (he took the open book in both hands) is the problem of gas exterminations, the only issue that truly touches upon the honor of Germany. So this is what I have come to tell you. Here (he showed me the book) you have given, in 1950, a most correct interpretation, when, in formulating your judgment, you came to the conclusion that there had been very few such exterminations and those few were the work of, I quote, 'only one or two insane persons in the S.S.' I would have said 'one or two criminal sadists.' Believe me, I knew this crowd well. As a whole it was a decent group, but it was not free -- like all social groups -- of a few sadists who were capable of the most unimaginable crimes. Globocnik was surely one of them. I know Höss only from what I had heard of him in Berlin from the people in my branch of service who knew him. He did not have a good reputation either. And, it is possible that at Auschwitz he behaved the way Globocnik did around Lublin. I do not know that for certain; I only say that it is possible. And, judging from what you yourself have written about that camp, it would have been easy for him since everything which was needed to make such activity possible was obtainable at Auschwitz."

I agreed, although I had not directed my supposition to any one particular camp -- for the very reason that one could give so little credit to that mass of false testimony and false documents on the subject that had been gathered by the various military tribunals. It was one of the hypotheses that I had advanced for the camps in general with the old adage, "where there is smoke, there is fire," in mind. Actually, all of my efforts tended to show that if there had been exterminations by gas they could only have been conducted on a very limited basis since there was no positive evidence to support the existence of the widespread practice.

"There were exterminations by gas," he concluded. "I have brought you an example." Then he added: "However, they were neither massive nor deliberately ordered by the

hierarchy of the Third Reich, in spite of what the evidence that was created out of thin air at Nuremberg, and that was verified by unscrupulous people, seemed to indicate; rather, such activities were the deeds of a few isolated criminals. What is certain is that each time that the authorities of the Third Reich were informed about things of this kind, they put an end to it, and I brought you proof of that. At Nuremberg, the prosecution simply made use of these isolated instances of criminal activity in order to establish the existence of an officially sanctioned practice for the purpose of dishonoring Germany. It is a little like claiming that the French systematically killed all of the German prisoners that they took during the war, basing the claim on the one case at Annecy on August 19, 1944. There are potential criminals among all peoples, and war -- which unleashes their instincts -- nurtures their depravity to incredible dimensions. Take the example of the French Resistance in whose name and Protection those criminals, of which unhappily France has the same kind and as many as Germany or any other country, committed their crimes (11). Consider the behavior of your troops during their occupation of Germany after May 1945..."(12)

He paused for a moment and then said, "Let it go at that, Sir. The honor of Germany will only be saved when it is definitely established that the exterminations by gas were the exception, and then only the act of a few criminals who were disowned as soon as they were uncovered. As for the rest, Heavens, it was war, and we are no better than Germany's enemies."(13)

I reassured him by telling him that if I stubbornly questioned every line of every document and deposition upon which was based this monstrous indictment of which Germany was the victim and that if my examination of this evidence caused me to conclude that it was nothing but the crudest of fabrications, it would not allow me to claim that there never had been an extermination by gas. Moreover, I had never claimed that, but only had stated that I had never found any reliable evidence to support that contention. "I am happy that I was fearful over nothing," he said. "Excuse me. Germany's honor owes much to you, and you richly deserve it."

And, that was the end. The discussion lost itself in generalities, but later we returned to the subject of Globocnik. I maintained that if he had only been transferred, which did not seem to me to have actually happened, the punishment had indeed been very light. "That," answered by interlocutor, "is characteristic of totalitarian systems. Those people sent so far from Berlin had been sent with the power given to Roman proconsuls. Moreover, the Nazi state was racist, and it did not consider crimes against the Jews in the same light as it viewed crimes against others; it was more indulgent towards those guilty of the former. The case of Koch, commandant at Buchenwald, who was shot for lesser crimes that had been committed against prisoners considered Aryan, is the proof. But, see what the State of Israel does. If they are gentiles, it demands the death sentence for all the *Kapos* guilty of crimes in the exercise of their duties as guards of gangs of prisoners in the concentration camps, and if they are Jewish, it finds many excuses for them and dismisses the charges or, at the most, imposes jail sentences of a few months, which are then suspended."

I shall spare the reader the details of the other subjects that we touched upon during the balance of our rambling conversation: the Versailles Treaty and its responsibility for the rise of German National Socialism, and, consequently, the outbreak of the Second World War; the war; wars, etc.

If I have made a point of ending this chapter with this testimony, it is because, on the one hand, a historian worthy of the name should not suppress anything that he knows which is relevant to the subject under discussion, and on the other, because I was not seriously able to impeach it except on one point. Moreover, whether right or wrong, the good faith of its author and his sincerity seemed obvious. It is one of the canons of historiography that a testimony cannot be impugned if it seems inconsistent on one point only. After all, history does not, so to speak, offer examples of testimonies that are perfectly consistent. This one, in fact, summed up the opinion which I had formed after a study of all of the documents and the testimony that was produced at Nuremberg on the subject of the extermination of the Jews by gas.

All this, however, does not at all mean that I endorse this testimony. *Testis unus, testis nullus*, that is also one of the laws of history, and I know only too well the ancient truth that nothing resembles perfect good faith more than perfect bad faith. Without going so far as to claim that this aphorism applied to my interlocutor, and I am far from wanting to conceal the pleasure and interest that I took in his conversation, I still must say that in spite of all that argues in his favor, and although his entry on the scene, regrettably late, can be excused by circumstances, his testimony can only be accepted with the most distinct reservations. All that one can say is that it is more acceptable than what we have so far been accustomed to, and in which we have been completely submerged. We shall not know what it is really worth unless those, who so zealously suppress impartial inquiry into the subject in an attempt to throttle the historical truth that they know, renounce the drastic measures that are resorted to keep it from coming to light, and, instead, assist it to return to an atmosphere of free discussion. Then, all of those persons who know or who think that they know something about any event whatsoever concerning the war can come forward and can publicize it, without fear of being thrown into prison. Incidentally, I can add that if some day I could be sure that my interlocutor could be questioned without running this risk, I am authorized to make known his name. He will not run away, he told me, and this is another good point for him and his testimony, and for everyone it might be the beginning of a return to free discussion. Check! Your turn to play, Mister Inquisitors.

FOOTNOTES

1. [The fact that the "*Diary of Anne Frank*" is a fabrication has been established pretty well since 1962 when Professor Rassinier was writing this book. It seems that the American Jewish writer Meyer Levin was hired by Otto Frank, the father of Anne, to write the Anne Frank *Diary*. The existence of this "literary collaboration" came to light when Mr. Levin sued Mr. Frank in the New York State courts for breach of contract. The dispute seems to have been settled out of court with Mr. Levin receiving the sum of \$50,000. For a further discussion of this matter, see the following: Richard Harwood, *Did Six Million Really Die?* (Richmond, Surrey: Historical Review Press, n.d.), pp. 19-20; Teresa Hendry, "Was Anne Frank's Diary a Hoax?" *The American Mercury*, Summer, 1967, pp. 26-28.]

2. Exhibit No. 100 of the Jerusalem judgment (Eichmann Trial) mentions that for France only 52,000, mostly non-French, had been deported by July 21, 1943, and that no deportation after that date was noted.

3. [It is strange, indeed, that the Germans -- who were far more advanced than the Allies in the development of chemical weapons -- should rely upon Zyklon B, an insecticide and disinfectant, as their primary killing agent in these alleged exterminations by gas when they had much more efficient gases, which had been designed specifically as "man-killing" agents, to choose from. For example, as early as 1936, I.G. Farbenindustrie was producing *Tabun*, the first of a family of nerve gases which the Germans were to develop by the end of the Second World War. (By contrast, the best gas in the Allies' arsenal was an improved version of the World War I "mustard gas.") *Tabun* -- which was regarded as a "quick kill" agent of tremendous potency -- was followed by the development of *Sarin* (1938) and *Soman* (1944). Only about 140 mg/meter³/minute of *Tabun* is needed to induce severe convulsions which are almost immediately followed by collapse, paralysis, and death. *Sarin* is twice as deadly as *Tabun* and *Soman* is many times more potent than *Sarin*. (See, Steven Rose, ed., *CBW. Chemical & Biological Warfare*, Boston: Beacon Press, 1968, pp. 23-24) By the end of the war, the Germans had stockpiled nearly twelve tons of *Tabun* and more than 250,000 tons of the more conventional chemical warfare agents like phosgene gas. (See, Seymour M. Hersch, *Chemical and Biological Warfare: America's Hidden Arsenal*, Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1968, pp. 7-12)]

4. Not taking into account the fantastic figures of Mme. Hannah Arendt, who does not seem to be very certain of herself in this area. Does she not in fact say (*New Yorker*, February 2, 1963) that "in less than two months 147 trains transported 434,351 Hungarian Jews to Auschwitz," and, (*New Yorker*, February 16, 1963) that among the Hungarian Jews there were 476,000 victims; "Que souvent femme varie, " as the French song says, "Comme la plume au vent," from one page to another with this one!

5. ["The most typical use of the Zyklon was in disinfecting rooms and barracks. Everything was sealed and then the necessary amount of Zyklon which came in green cans . . . was emptied in. After the proper time interval it was assumed that all the lice and other insects and pests were dead and then the enclosure was aired out. The Zyklon could be used for disinfecting clothing by employing an 'extermination chamber'..." Arthur R. Butz, *The Hoax of the Twentieth Century* (Richmond, Surrey: Historical Review Press, [1976]), p. 105. However, Zyklon B also was lethal to human beings in as much as its crystals, "when exposed to air, sublimated into 'Prussic Acid' (hydrogen cyanide gas)." (*op. cit.* p. 104.)]

6. To reach that total I took the general total of Jewish losses given by Mr. Raul Hilberg (p. 767) for the five camps and for Auschwitz, that is 1,950,000, and I deducted his estimate of Jewish losses at Auschwitz (p. 670), that is 1,000,000, which leaves 950,000. So as not to overlook anything, we must state that in his own table (p. 570) Majdanek is listed under "Lublin district."

7. Except the Institute of Jewish Affairs of the World Jewish Congress, in *Eichmann's Confederates and the Third Reich Hierarchy*, which gives 900,000 (p. 18).

8. We have seen that Dr. Aryeh L. Kubovy, Director of the *Center of Contemporary Jewish Documentation* at Tel-Aviv, admitted in 1960 that "there exists no document signed by Hitler, Himmler, or Heydrich speaking of exterminating of the Jews and the word 'extermination' does not appear in the letter from Göring to Heydrich concerning the final solution to the Jewish question." In regard to this issue, Mme. Hannah Arendt, who makes the Führer's order to exterminate the Jews the central theme of her report on the Eichmann Trial at Jerusalem, labors in vain. This divergence of opinion is a problem which needs to be worked out between herself and Dr. Kubovy, and we can only advise her to come to an understanding with him, who for once -- by chance, mischance, or good faith -- is himself in agreement with the historical truth.

9. This incident took place on August 18, 1942. The construction of this camp -- which had been authorized at the Wannsee conference -- had been begun at the end of March of that year, and it had taken a very long time to build, mainly because of the fact that a single track rail line had to be constructed as a branch line in order to connect the camp to the nearest existing mainline tracks. That mainline track had to be either the one that went from Budapest to Warsaw, via Przmysl and Lublin, or the one from Budapest to Wilna, via Lvov. My interlocutor could not tell me whether the branch line had been attached near Przmysl or Lvov. In either case, it would have required the building of at least 50 km. of track, and this track was not ready for use until the end of July.

10. According to Jewish sources, which are unanimous in agreement, this camp was not closed until the beginning of December 1942. It does not appear that Globocnik was demoted or punished. In any case, if he was, the punishment was light, especially when that punishment is compared with the punishment that was given to Karl Koch, the celebrated commandant of Buchenwald, who was executed for doing much less.

11. [For a good account of that bloody period which followed the so-called "Liberation of France," see *France: The Tragic Years 1939-1947* (New York: Devin-Adair, 1955) by Sisley Huddleston, especially Chapter Twenty-three. Contrary to the impression that has been created by the scores of Hollywood war movies which have dealt with the period, French "resistance" to the German occupation of France during World War II was not a "mass movement" by any means. Rather, the number of Frenchmen who collaborated with the Germans -- to one extent or another -- far exceeded the number of "resistants" who, it seems (based upon the number of membership cards that were issued by the French government after the war to veterans of the resistance) totaled somewhat more than 250,000. In any case, the combined number of "resistants" and collaborators was small when compared to the vast majority of the French population which remained apathetic and outwardly indifferent to the German occupation. After all, it made little practical difference to the average "man on the street" whether it was the Germans or his own countrymen who were actually guiding governmental policy once the French civil service had resumed operation and once life had returned to its normal pace following the signing of the Armistice with Germany on June 22, 1940. This uncomfortable reality was the subject of the four and one-half hour television film *Le Chagrin et la Pitié* which was produced by Marcel Ophuls in 1969 and which, incidentally, was not aired over the state-controlled French television network until after the death of Charles de Gaulle.

A portion of the filmscript has been published in an English translation under the title *The Sorrow and the Pity* (New York: Outerbridge and Lazard, 1972).

The French make a distinction when they speak of "resistants": there are those few persons -- like Paul Rassinier -- who engaged in organized resistance against the Germans almost immediately following the defeat of the French army in the spring of 1940; and, then, there are those numerous individuals who joined the "resistance" after the German fortunes of war began to wane -- i.e., generally after June, 1944. Many of these so-called "late" resistants joined the "underground" in an eleventh hour attempt to redeem themselves for their earlier collaboration with the Germans. Many others were Communists. In fact, the cadres of the resistance movement at that late date were almost exclusively made up of Communists who were financed by the Americans, who were armed by the British, and who followed the Stalinist line.

It was the Communists who were primarily responsible for escalating the ineffectual guerilla war against the Germans and who, indirectly, caused so much suffering among the innocent French populace in the form of German reprisals. The Communists, moreover, did not confine themselves to the assassination of Germans. They took advantage of the general disorder following the "Liberation" to murder as many of their domestic political opponents -- whom they prudently had branded as "fascists" and "collaborators" -- as they could get their hands on. The precise number of victims has never been determined. However, a former French minister of the interior has estimated that about 105,000 "summary executions" occurred between August 1944 and March 1945. (Huddleston, *op. cit.*, pages 299-300.) Others have placed the number at about 50,000. (See, e.g., Donald B. Robinson, "Blood Bath in France," *The American Mercury*, April 1946.) Regardless of what the true figure may be, there can be little doubt that, as Huddleston put it, "there has never been, in the history of France, a bloodier period than that which followed the Liberation of 1944-1945. The massacres of 1944 were no less savage than the massacres of the Jacquerie, of St. Bartholomew, of the Revolutionary Terror, of the Commune; and they were certainly more numerous and on a wider scale." (Huddleston, *op. cit.*, page 296.)]

12. [The behavior of the Allies during their occupation of Germany was so generally atrocious that it has been a subject that most liberal apologists for the American participation in World War II would like to forget, especially when moralizing about the crimes and the shortcomings of the Germans. For a more objective view of the military occupation of Germany, the following titles offer an adequate, but by no means an exhaustive, treatment of the subject: Andy Rooney & Bud Hutton, *Conqueror's Peace* (Garden City: Doubleday & Co., 1947); Victor Gollancz, *Our Threatened Values* (Chicago: Henry Regnery, 1946) and *In Darkest Germany* (Chicago: Henry Regnery, 1947); Marshall Knappen, *And Call It Peace* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1949); Freda Uitley, *The High Cost of Vengeance* (Chicago: Henry Regnery, 1949); W.K. Turnwald, ed., *Documents on the Expulsion of the Sudeten Germans* (Munich: University Press, 1953); Ernst von Salomon, *Fragebogen* (Garden City: Doubleday & Co., 1955); Juergen Thorwald, *Flight in Winter* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1953); Nicholas Balabkins, *Germany Under Direct Controls* (New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 1961); Harold Zink, *American Military Government in Germany* (New York: Macmillan, 1947).]

13. [For the reader who desires to obtain a better understanding of the "atrocities" that were committed by the Allies during World War Two, the following titles provide a good introduction to the subject: Hans Grimm, *Answer of a German: An Open Letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury* (London: Euphenon Books, 1952); F.J.P. Veale, *Advance to Barbarism* (Appleton, Wis.: C.C. Nelson, 1953) and *War Crimes Discreetly Veiled* (New York: Devin-Adair, 1959); Hans Rumpf, *The Bombing of Germany* (New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1963); Louis Fitzgibbon, *Katyn, A Crime Without Parallel* (New York: Scribners & Sons, 1971); Julius Epstein, *Operation Keelhaul* (Old Greenwich, Conn.: Devin-Adair, 1973); Peter H. Nicoll, *Britain's Blunder* (East Orange, NJ.: Communications Archives, 1973), especially pages 117-125.]

(**) AAARGH additional note: The 7th edition, by Druffel-Verlag (1981) has a somewhat different title: *Was ist Wahrheit ?* and the subtitle is: *Die Juden und das Dritte Reich*. (What is Truth? The Jews and the Third Reich.)

Chapter Fourteen

Statistics: Six Million or...

After some fifteen years of historical research, I have come to the following conclusion: it was in 1943 that National Socialist Germany was accused for the first time of the systematic mass extermination of the Jews in the gas chambers. The author of this first, horrible and infamous accusation was a Polish Jew, a refugee in England and a jurist by profession, by the name of Rafael Lemkin. And, he made that accusation in a book published in London, and in English, in that year, entitled *Axis Rule in Occupied Europe* (Am. ed., New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1944). At the time the book did not receive much attention; in October, 1943, when I was arrested by the Gestapo, it was still completely unknown in the best informed circles of the French Resistance, and I only heard of gas chambers for the first time at Dora, toward the middle of 1944. But in 1945-1946, *Axis Rule in Occupied Europe* was the topic of all conversation behind the scenes at the Trial of the Major War Criminals at Nuremberg, where it was cited by the prosecution in the case of Seyss-Inquart (T. XIX, pp. 70 and 92). And, the view maintained in the book was supported by the *Kasztner Report* on the tragedy of the Hungarian Jews, a report which was also talked about in the corridors during the trial. But, we must be precise and say that it was only after January 30, 1946, the date when French Prosecutor Dubost made public his discovery of the Gerstein document, that these two pieces of writing took on importance. In fact, it was on that day that, in the world press, the gas chambers mythology began its dance to every tune and diabolical rhythm; that unrestrained saraband full of missteps has not stopped since.

Let us try to reconstruct the facts. Until January 30, 1946, aside from the *Axis Rule in Occupied Europe* and the *Kasztner Report*, which were only secondhand testimonies, the prosecution and the judges at Nuremberg had only direct testimonies which, juridically, were not much more authentic, given the way in which they were adduced by their authors. All of these witnesses had been interned at Auschwitz, and, as for gas chambers, either they knew nothing about them, or they only knew about them through their prison comrades who were "trustworthy" and who they generally did not name, or who were already dead, if they did name them. Second hand testimony again. An example of this kind of testimony is provided by Dr. Benedikt Kautski who did not appear at court, but, as we have seen, who wrote a book and had his short hour of fame. Another is that of Madame Vaillant-Couturier who arrived at the Auschwitz camp in January 1943, who was a communist, who, for that reason, was hidden away in the hospital where she was an important personage in the *Häftlingsführung*, and who, in answer to the question as to whether the hospital had been open to Jews when they were sick, coldly replied to French Prosecutor Dubost, "No, when we got there the Jews did not have the right to go there; they were taken directly to the gas chamber if they were sick." (T. VI, p. 219.) Now, never was a false witness brought before the bar of a Tribunal with such calm assurance, since in January 1943 there existed -- if indeed, there ever existed -- no gas chamber at Auschwitz, the official

word being that they were not installed until the end of February 1943. There is no end to the number of false witnesses of this kind that could be cited. But, for the first time, with the Gerstein document, the prosecution had a first-hand witness. But wasn't Gerstein dead? Yes, but he had written, or, at least, he had signed, a statement -- at least that is what was claimed. Was not this statement about Auschwitz? No, not in so far as it concerned what he had seen; but invoices for Zyklon B that was delivered to that camp were appended. His description of extermination by gas in other camps portrayed the operation in such a degree of horror that the journalists assigned to the trial decided that their emphasis of that theme would be sure to sell newspapers at home. The judges themselves accorded much less importance to the Gerstein allegations, but they allowed the journalists a free hand; even though they did not actually encourage them, they never gave them their true impressions of the Gerstein document, which was presented to public opinion as though it had been admitted into evidence when actually it had been rejected (as was discussed in the preceding chapter).

Dr. Benedikt Kautski's book did not come out until the end of 1946. Therefore, it did not play a part in the trial of the Major War Criminals. As a secondhand testimony on gas chambers it would not have been any great help. To have a description of the gas exterminations at Auschwitz as precise as that of the Gerstein document on Belzec, the prosecution had to wait until 1951 and *Médecin à Auschwitz* by Miklos Nyiszli, about whom we have also learned what to think in the preceding chapters. Since then, nothing. No other *de visu* witnesses. The literature of the concentration camps -- the historians like Hans Rothfels, Golo Mann, or Raul Hilberg, the *War Crimes Commission of Warsaw*, and the *Center of Contemporary Jewish Documentation*, their propagandists like Leon Poliakov or Hannah Arendt, the *Institut für Zeitgeschichte* at Munich, or showmen and film directors like Piscator (producer of *Der Stellvertreter* by Hochhuth) -- has never been able to bring forth, as far as I know, any more than those two testimonies, both of which I believe I have proved were obviously apocryphal. I shall not belabor the point.

Not having been able to establish the existence of gas extermination any better than that, those championing the genocide indictment did not have much better luck when they wanted to number the losses in human lives. In 1945-1946, during the trial of the Major War Criminals, they found themselves in the following situation: Mr. Rafael Lemkin said simply, "millions;" Dr. Rudolf Kasztner spoke only of Hungarian Jews whose number he estimated to be about 800,000 (page 1 of his *Report*), and he calculated (page 8) that "500,000 had been deported on the Karchau-Odenberg route between May 15, 1944, and the beginning of July," that is, the 7th, as he makes clear a little farther on; the figures given in the Gerstein document led to results so astronomical that they were useless (it is, perhaps, not useless to recall that all the rest of the material in the document was, at the time, used only by the press because the President of the Tribunal refused even to have it read by the French Prosecutor Dubost); Höttl and Wisliceny, who, under the circumstances we already know about, spoke in terms of six and five million respectively, estimates that both said came from Eichmann. Finally, Mr. Justice Jackson, as we have seen, added to this confusing state of affairs when he stated in his speech of November 21, 1945, that:

Of the 9,600,000 Jews who were living in Nazi dominated Europe, it is estimated, with full knowledge of the facts, that sixty per cent perished;

5,700,000 Jews are missing from countries where they lived before, and more than 4,000,000 cannot be accounted for, either by a natural death rate, or immigration into other lands. (*I.M.T.* II, p. 128).

The figure of 4,500,000 exterminated was the claim of the prosecution, and it was, just the beginning. But, it is not easy to see how, between May 8, 1945, and the 21st of November, Mr. Justice Jackson was able to obtain full knowledge of the facts. Since no official census took place during that period of time -- in any case, how could it have taken place in such a chaos of populations displaced and moving about in every direction? -- it is plainly only a purely conjectural estimate. Be that as it may, it was not sustained in the judgment against the Major War Criminals, and the press sustained Höttl's estimate. Since then, except for Mr. Gerald Reitlinger, who alone came to a conclusion more or less in accord with Mr. Justice Jackson -- i.e., of 4,200,000 to 4,600,000 exterminated, everything has happened as if, once having laid down the principle that Höttl's estimate was well founded, all of the other statisticians who have worked on the figures in the same spirit as the *Warsaw Commission*, the *Center of Contemporary Jewish Documentation*, or the *Institut für Zeitgeschichte* of Munich had never had any other purpose except to prove that the estimates of Höttl and Wisliceny corresponded with reality. What is noticeable from the very first is that while they have all come to an overall result in the neighborhood of six million, they do not come to it by the same routes, since the allocation in detail by countries of these six million presents considerable disparities. The clearest example of these differences, it seems to me, is Poland, where Mr. Salo Baron, holder of the chair of Jewish History at Columbia University, found that on the arrival of Russian troops in the country 700,000 Jews were still there (according to his statement of April 24, 1961, at the Eichmann Trial); the *World Center of Jewish Documentation* at Paris gave the figure of 500,000 (communiqué to the *Figaro littéraire* of June 4, 1960), the *Institute of Jewish Affairs* claimed some 400,000 (*Eichmann's Confederates and the Third Reich Hierarchy*, p. 59), and Mr. Raul Hilberg found only 50,000 (*The Destruction of the European Jews*, p. 670). The distribution by camp, or sector of destruction, is not the same either, and offers disparities just as glaring, depending upon which one of these statisticians is referred to. For example: about 4,000,000 Jews met their fate at Auschwitz, the rest in other extermination camps, or in the open at the hands of the *Einsatzgruppen*, we are told by Leon Poliakov, Olga Wormer, and Henri Michel, among others. This distribution manifestly takes into account the Warsaw judgment that condemned Höss to be hanged on the charge of having caused the death at Auschwitz of 2,812,000 persons, 2,500,000 of them Jews, from May 1940 to December 1943; therefore, it is argued that this figure is not so far from the four million figure that is claimed for the whole term of the camp; to round things out, 1,950,000 is claimed for all the other camps, another million at Auschwitz (900,000 as corrected by the *Institute of Jewish Affairs*), 1,400,000 by the *Einsatzgruppen*, and the remainder in "Mobile operations" as Mr. Raul Hilberg tells us. We must also point out that the latter does not seem to be very sure of the figures himself since he comes to a total of 5,100,000 on page 767 of *The Destruction of the European Jews*, while he gets 5,407,500 on page 670. For all extermination camps other than Auschwitz Mr. Raul Hilberg gives us 950,000, but the Warsaw Commission and the Judgment of the Jerusalem Tribunal found "850,000 for only four out of five of them" (Chelmno, Belzec, Sobibor and Treblinka, cp. chap. XXIII, p. 80).

All this shows how serious they are and how much to credit their documentary sources, which, although the same for all the statisticians, speak to each of them in so different a language that the only point of agreement is the total number of Jewish losses between 5 and 6 million human lives, when they all make their additions -- except for the more modest Reitlinger and for Poliakov who says "between 5 and 7 million" (*Le Troisième Reich et les Juifs*). However, with regard to Reitlinger and Poliakov, they settle on 6 million, which is the mathematical mean.

The reader will readily understand that, faced with this jumble of contradictory calculations, rather than to take up each of the references one by one and to go over each of the additions, I have preferred, by using statistics all from Jewish sources, to try to reconstitute in detail, country by country, the world Jewish population of 1946, and compare it with what it was when National Socialism came to power in Germany in 1933. Rightly or wrongly, this procedure seems to me to be the best method, as we go along, to show up the shameless falsifications of the *Warsaw Commission*, the *World Center of Contemporary Jewish Documentation*, the *Institut für Zeitgeschichte* of Munich, and all of their supporters, authors, propagandists, journalists, historians, and others. I imagine that the reader will also readily understand that the statistics which follow cannot be considered correct down to a unit. In the matter of population statistics it is never possible to arrive at more than approximate conclusions, since the figures are based purely on interrogations of interested persons whose answers, when they can be gotten, are always unreliable, or they are not to be had at all because of the faultiness, or even the lack, of a civil service in a very great number of countries.

In the matter of the Jewish population, the vague sort of aversion which all Jews, since the days of Herod, have shown toward census taking is another source of errors. It is these two constant reservations which make approximations of all statistics. Nevertheless, as all statisticians concede, the errors will be so slight as to be negligible in the conclusions drawn from a comparison of two or more sets of figures, if they are of the same origin. With that granted, where do we stand in this month of July 1963?

II. Postwar Statistics

In 1951 the *World Almanac* published statistics from which it was concluded that there were then only 11,303,350 Jews in the world as against 16,643,120 in 1939. This conclusion was given as the result of research on the part of the *American Jewish Committee Year Book* and the Jewish Statistic Bureau of the Synagogue Council which had spent the years 1949 and 1950 at it.

Presented as they were, there are many reasons for thinking that the *World Almanac* statistics of 1951 were primarily an answer to a study which appeared on February 22, 1948, in the *New York Times* on the statistical data given by Hanson W. Baldwin, the *Times* expert on Jewish population matters. He claimed that in 1947, based on a secret census undertaken by the Jews themselves, there were living in the world between a minimum of 15,000,000 and a maximum of 18,000,000 Jews. He also claimed that between 650,000 and 750,000 of these Jews were living in Palestine and that 500,000 were living in the other countries of the Middle East. In October 1959, the *American Mercury* (pp. 14 to 17) reviewed all of these figures and brought the controversy up to date. In reply to the *American Mercury*, the 1960 edition of the *World Almanac* gave,

for the year 1959, a world Jewish population of 12,299,780. Then, another bit of information from a Jewish source, which was widely circulated by the world press, appeared in 1963. The Hamburg daily, *Die Welt*, of April 1, 1963, for example, reported that:

There are only about 13 million Jews still in the world. In 1939 there were 16,673,000. This information was given out over the weekend by the London Institute of Jewish Affairs. Most of the Jews, about 5,500,000, are today living in the U.S.A. In Israel there are 2,045,000 in the Soviet Union 2,300,000, and in Great Britain 450,000 Jews. (1)

But, in the *Israel Almanach* (5719 in the Jewish calendar, 1958-1959 in the common calendar, P. 282) a Mr. Eric Peretz tells us that "the Jewish population of the state of Israel represents one eighth of the world Jewish population," and he fixed it at "one million eight hundred thousand." Meanwhile, a Mr. Marc Cohen puts that eighth at "two million." So, in that year, the thirteen million Jews of whom a world census was taken again in 1962 by the Institute of Jewish Affairs of London was either 14,00,000, if one prefers the first estimate, or 16 million, if one chooses the second. Incidentally, the *Israel Almanach* is published in Jerusalem by the "Youth and Hehabouts Department" of the world Zionist movement.

Only out of concern for accuracy and completeness do I give the puerile statement which Mr. Salo Baron, waving his title of Professor of Jewish History at Columbia University, made before the bar of the Jerusalem Tribunal on April 24, 1961; it is herewith summarized from a report that appeared in the *Figaro* of the next day:

1. "Since 1945 the world Jewish population has increased at the rate of 20%."
2. "In 1939, there were about 16 million of us in the world. We should, therefore, be about 19,000,000 today, and we are only 12 million."

He makes up for his lack of historical knowledge with a very good knowledge of mathematics: 16 million minus 6 million equals 10 million, which, in turn, plus twenty per cent equals 12 million. His conclusion is mathematically indisputable! Now, it only remains for the Professor to establish, first, that the rate of increase of the world Jewish population was indeed 20% in 16 years and, second, that 6 million Jews were indeed exterminated. Well, let us proceed . . .

Let us proceed with the consideration of one particular element of world Jewry: the Jewish population in the United States. In 1959, the *American Jewish Committee Year Book* and the Jewish Statistical Bureau of the Synagogue Council estimated the American Jewish population at 5,185,000 for the year of 1949, and in 1959, at 5,260,000 for the year of 1958. From which we can conclude that if the world Jewish population increased by twenty per cent from 1945 to 1961, or 1.25% per year, as Mr. Salo Baron proclaimed at the Jerusalem Tribunal, America, at least, was an exception to the rule where the population was decreasing. And, for Russia, the information from the Institute of Jewish Affairs, which puts the population at 2,300,000 in 1962, hardly seems any more serious, if Mr. Nahum Goldmann is to be believed, who, in a report to the World Jewish Congress on September 12, 1963, said: "From 1948 to 1963 Jews in the USSR increased to about *three million*, according to five writers

since dead, and one almanac and two periodicals." (*Le Figaro*, Paris, September 13, 1963). In 1961 Mr. Nahum Goldmann had already produced these figures before the World Jewish Congress. Just the same, there is a difference of 700,000 between 2,300,000 and 3 million ...

During the whole of 1959, the Jewish population of the United States was the object, in the United States itself, of very strained discussion, after the publication in 1951 of *The Iron Curtain Over America*, (Dallas: Wilkinson, 1951) in which the author, Mr. John Beaty, complained that the 1924 immigration law was constantly broken and that "since the end of the Second World War the problem of illegal entry has increased tremendously." (p. 45). And, he cited the Jewish immigration from eastern Europe as an example of such illegal immigration. (pp. 36-43). Here again it is the *American Mercury* which gave emphasis to the discussion. It underlined two things in particular concerning the Jewish immigration:

1. "The principal world Zionist organizations proudly proclaim that two-thirds of the Jews of the world are now living in the United States." And it concluded that if the figures which Hanson W. Baldwin published in the *New York Times* of February 22, 1948, correspond to reality, it was not of 5,185,000 or 5,260,000 that one should speak, as the statistics from Jewish sources claimed, but of 10,766,666 or 12,800,000 (in 1947!). In any case, Jewish statistics for 1959 claimed that the world Jewish population had risen that year to 12,299,780 persons. If it is true that two-thirds of them were living in the United States, that makes, after all, 8,200,000, or, according to the information of *Die Welt* (also from a Jewish source) 8,667,000 for the year 1962, and not 5,500,000 as that information claims.

2. The other aspect of the problem was that during the year 1959 the Census Bureau of the United States government decided to conduct a census in 1960 to determine the extent of illegal immigration into the United States. All of the world Zionist organizations immediately protested -- and successfully, the *American Mercury* pointed out -- when the Census Bureau turned to the churches and to the synagogues with the object of finding out the number of persons who claimed membership within their congregations. The Zionist leaders stated, still according to the *American Mercury*, that it was "a violation of the principle of the separation of Church and State" -- as set forth in the Constitution of the United States -- for such a census to be taken and even that the proposed action of the census officials would draw down the wrath of God." The true reasons for this opposition can be seen easily; such a census, conducted in that manner, would have brought to light the vast extent of the Jewish immigration into the United States since 1933 and would have forever destroyed the myth of the six million Jewish victims of Nazi "genocide." That none of them at once calculated the Jewish population of the United States at 12 million is not astonishing, particularly if they had read the *New York Times* article!

Since then, the figure of 12 million has become accepted, more or less, by American public opinion makers, as shown by this excerpt from the *National Observer* of July 2, 1962:

The nation's major religious groups, representing more than 40 Protestant, Eastern Orthodox, Roman Catholic, and Jewish denominations have joined

forces to tackle one of the country's thorniest domestic problems: race relations.

They have called the first National Conference on Religion and Race to be held next January in Chicago. About 600 clerical and lay leaders, representing nearly 100,000,000 Americans, are expected to participate. One stated objective of the conference is to demonstrate the concern of religious leaders over racial segregation by a "statement of conscience."

Participating will be the National Council of Churches, an organization of 33 Protestant and Eastern Orthodox denominations with nearly 40,000,000 members; the National Catholic Welfare Conference, the administrative agency of Catholic Bishops (there are 43,000,000 Catholics in the nation); and the Synagogue Council of America, which is representative of Jewish bodies at the national level. (Rabbinic bodies of Orthodox, Conservative, and Reform Judaism are represented. There are about 12,000,000 Jews in the United States.)

Such are the points of view that confront each other concerning the Jewish population of the United States. We shall see farther on that for Poland, Russia, and, in a general way, for all of Central and Balkan Europe, statistics of Jewish origin pose in no less a brutal fashion the problem of their obvious falsification.

III. Prewar Statistics

In 1932, a Jewish journal that was published in New York, the *Menorah Journal*, (No. 2, February) printed an analysis of the world Jewish population, the facts for which had been taken from the most noted Jewish statistician of the times, Mr. Arthur Ruppin. (2) The latter, said the *Menorah Journal*, had classified the Jews of the whole world, by occupation and by country. By occupation, it gave the conclusions just as they had been formulated by the statistician. By countries, it gave, in diminishing order, only those where there were more than 100,000 Jews, being content, for the others, to classify them in three categories, between 50,000 and 100,000, between 10,000 and 50,000, and less than 10,000. The following is how the figures appeared:

A. By occupations

Commerce.....	6,1 00,000 or 38.6%
Crafts and industries.....	5,730,000 or 36.4%
Rentiers.....	2,000,000 or 2.7%
Professions.....	1,000,000 or 6.3%
Agriculture.....	625,000 or 4%
In service, laborers.....	325,000 or 2%
Totals.....	15,780,000 100%

B. By countries

United States.....	4,500,000
Poland.....	3,100,000
Russia.....	3,000,000
Rumania.....	900,000
Germany.....	500,000
England.....	330,000
France.....	250,000
Palestine	250,000
Argentina	240,000
Austria.....	230,000
Canada.....	170,000
Lithuania.....	160,000
Low countries.....	120,000
French Morocco.....	120,000
Iraq.....	100,000
Other.....	1,810,000
Total.....	15,780,000

The other countries showed up this way:

1. Countries with between 50,000 and 100,000 Jews:

Latvia, Greece, Yugoslavia, Belgium, Italy, Turkey, Bulgaria, Algeria, South Africa, Tunisia, Egypt.

2. Countries with between 10,000 and 50,000 Jews:

Switzerland, Brazil, Mexico, Uruguay, Persia, Syria, Yemen, India, Afghanistan, China, Spanish Morocco, Tripoli, Australia.

3. Countries with fewer than 10,000 Jews:

Danzig, Sweden, Denmark, Esthonia, Ireland, Spain, Rhodes, Memel, Portugal, Norway, Finland, Cuba, Chile, Japan, Singapore, New Zealand.

All of the preceding figures are dated from 1926 to 1928 and represent 0.8% of the population of the world, then calculated at two billion inhabitants.

In 1932, population movements only interested me professionally, that is, in their major lines of force, and, as far as the Jewish population was concerned, at that time these statistics seemed to me to give a good enough picture so that I felt informed on the matter. I remember having noted that from 1877 to 1932 the Jewish population of the United States had risen from 230,000 to 4,500,000, while that of France had increased from 150,000 to 250,000 between 1850 and the same date, and I concluded that the migration of European Jews was in the direction of the United States via Western Europe. From the lands of pogroms to the land of liberty. For me that was the main point. So, in 1934, when Arthur Ruppin's *Les Juifs dans le Monde moderne* came out in France, I did not read it. But, that was a mistake. Had I read Ruppin's

original work, I would surely have noticed that the *Menorah Journal* had, for instance, failed to mention Hungary and Czechoslovakia. I was wrong again in not foreseeing that later on I would need figures more exact than those that that publication gave for Belgium, Yugoslavia, Greece, and the like. After the war, when I needed all that information, I was not able to put my hands on a copy of Arthur Ruppin's work, which had so mysteriously disappeared from circulation, except after exercising the wiles of a Sioux Indian. In 1960, when I published *Ulysse trahi par les siens*, I had not yet succeeded, and for Hungary and Czechoslovakia I had to be satisfied with working out, as a note to the figures quoted, the figures of the *World Center of Contemporary Jewish Documentation*, leaving it up to the reader to add them to the total which I found for the population of European Jews in countries occupied by Germany, and which came to 8,700,000, but at the same time cautioning the reader that the figures were clearly exaggerated by some 404,000 for Hungary and some 315,000 for Czechoslovakia.

Here now are Mr. Arthur Ruppin's statistics for those countries of Europe occupied by the Germans during World War Two:

Poland.....	3,100,000
Russia.....	3,000,000
Rumania.....	900,000
Germany.....	500,000
Hungary.....	320,000
Czechoslovakia.....	260,000
France.....	250,000
Austria.....	230,000
Lithuania.....	160,000
Low countries.....	120,000
Latvia.....	80,000
Greece.....	75,000
Yugoslavia.....	70,000
Belgium.....	60,000
Italy.....	50,000
Bulgaria.....	50,000
Denmark.....	7,000
Esthonia.....	5,000
Norway.....	2,000
Finland.....	2,000
Luxemburg.....	2,000
Total.....	9,243,000

From 1932 to 1939, philo-Semites or anti-Semites, everyone who talked about the European or the world Jewish population referred to Arthur Ruppin. In Europe, the first drew attention to the fact that about 9 million European Jews were menaced by National Socialism; the second made use of his classification by occupations to conclude that according to the Jews themselves, few among them really worked, and, in Germany, that was one of the grounds of National Socialism for the accusation of Jewish social parasitism.

I should say that in his study Arthur Ruppin warned that because of the difficulties inherent in all population studies, in particular that of Jewish populations, the figures he gave did not have an indisputable and absolute value. With that consideration in mind, I shall concede that the 9,243,000 Jews in Europe occupied by the Germans could just as well be 9 million. In addition, I shall concede that in figuring 9.6 million, Mr. Justice Jackson had not exaggerated so badly; at least, his overestimation was very much less than the postwar statisticians of the *World Almanac* (cp. on p. 103, the estimate of the Jewish population in 1938, as published in the 1948 edition). In fact, one can hardly say that he exaggerated at all. He had not left anyone out, that's all. His great mistake was in not having thought that in 1939 the Jewish population of those countries was not the same as in 1931; in other words, he erred by not taking into account Jewish emigration during the period when they were directly threatened by National Socialism. He should be censured, therefore, for having stated positively, without any proof -- not having and not being able to have "full knowledge of the facts," as he boldly claimed -- that sixty per cent of that population, certainly overestimated by him, were absent from the roll call at the time he pronounced his indictment.

Finally, in parallel columns, on page 302, are the estimates of Jewish losses published by the *World Center of Contemporary Jewish Documentation* at Paris (*Le Figaro Littéraire*, June 4, 1960) and by Mr. Raul Hilberg in 1961 (*The Destruction of the European Jews*, p. 670).

My first idea had been to put into parallel columns three sets of statistics, the third being those published also in 1961 by the Institute of Jewish Affairs in *Eichmann's Confederates and the Third Reich Hierarchy*. But that compilation was limited to a list of Jewish losses by country without further reference to their numbers in 1939 other than by percentages.

By stretching Mr. Raul Hilberg's figures for Poland, Czechoslovakia and Russia a little, the *Institute of Jewish Affairs* gives a total of 5,717,000 exterminated, representing, it points out, 68 percent of the Jewish population of those countries in 1939. From which one can conclude that the prewar Jewish population of those countries came to 8,400,000. The discrepancy is significant only with regard to Poland, for which the Institute gives 400,000 survivors, where Mr. Raul Hilberg came up with only 50,000; Mr. Salo Baron got 700,000; and the *World Center of Contemporary Jewish Documentation* of Paris, found 500,000. Where it found two million survivors in Russia, Mr. Raul Hilberg found 2,600,000. 360,000 Jews are claimed by the Institute to have been living in Czechoslovakia in 1939, while Mr. Raul Hilberg is content with 315,000, and Mr. Arthur Ruppin with 260,000. In addition, there are a few other misuses. Upon reflection, the dose of phantasy which is provided by the statistics which are set forth on page 302 struck me as quiet enough for the time being, and I finally decided to refrain from citing the third set of figures in addition.

Table p. 302

	WCJD			Hilberg		
Country	1939	1946	Losses	1939	1946	Losses
France	300,000	180,000	120,000	270,000	200,000	70,000
Belgium	90,000	50,000	40,000	140,000	20,000	120,000
Holland	150,000	60,000	90,000	140,000	20,000	120,000
Denmark	7,000	6,500	500	6,500	5,500	1,000
Norway	1,500	600	900	2,000	1,000	1,000
Esthonia	5,000	1,000	4,000	4,500	---	4,500
Latvia	95,000	10,000	85,000	95,000	---	95,000
Lithuania	150,000	15,000	135,000	145,000	---	145,000
Poland	3,300,000	500,000	2,800,000	3,350,000	50,000	3,300,000
Germany	210,000	40,000	170,000	240,000	80,000	160,000
Czechoslov.	315,000	55,000	260,000	315,000	44,000	271,000
Austria	60,000	20,000	40,000	60,000	7,000	53,000
Hungray	404,000	204,000	200,000	400,000	200,000	200,000
Yugoslavia	75,000	20,000	55,000	75,000	12,000	63,000
Rumania	850,000	425,000	425,000	800,000	430,000	370,000
Italy	57,000	42,000	15,000	50,000	33,000	17,000
USSR	2,100,000	600,000	1,500,000	3,020,000	2,600,000	420,000
Bulgaria	50,000	43,000	7,000	50,000	47,000	3,000
Greece	75,000	15,000	60,000	74,000	12,000	62,000
Luxemburg	3,000	1,000	2,000	3,000	1,000	2,000
TOTALS	8,297,500	2,288,100	6,009,400	9,190,000	3,782,500	5,407,500

Now, let us have a look at our two sets of statistics. They have the following in common:

1. In comparison with the statistics of Mr. Arthur Ruppin they both take into account the Jewish migration between 1933 and 1939, but for Germany and Austria only. With regard to this emigration everyone, including the statistics of Richard Korherr, head of the Population Bureau of the Third Reich, dated April 17, 1943, is in agreement, a most rare occurrence, in estimating the Jewish emigration at 300,000 from Germany, and 180,000 from Austria. The exaggeration of Mr. Raul Hilberg is unimportant because, being of the same magnitude and kind in the two columns, it does not involve the number of exterminated obtained by comparison. It calls for only one comment: one piece of the record with which he was not acquainted.

2. The victims are largely accounted for by overestimating the prewar Jewish population and minimizing the postwar Jewish population, a little everywhere, but mainly in Poland, Hungary, and Czechoslovakia. We notice that these prewar overestimations lie between 50,000 and 100,000 per country, sometimes more (200,000 for Poland!). If they have minimized proportionately the number of survivors, and on the supposition that ten out of the twenty countries concerned in these statistics are affected by an exaggeration of this kind (it was obviously not possible everywhere, in Norway or Denmark, for instance), an exaggeration of at least 50,000 per country would account for a million of the total number of those who claimed to have been exterminated, obtained by the difference, and an exaggeration of

100,000 per country, would yield a total of 2 million. But, that is only a gratuitous supposition, and I only make it here to show how a little stream can easily become a great river. Later on we shall see what the actual worth of these two statistics is. Each thing in its own time.

Next, let us examine the divergences that are presented by comparing the aforementioned statistics:

1. The total number of survivors varies by about 1.5 million from one to the other, and of those exterminated by a little more than 600,000. In both cases such a variation is a significant margin;

2. Looking at it closely, this divergence derives from the evaluations, respectively, for Russia and Poland. For the first, the figure of 2,100,000 given by the *World Center of Contemporary Jewish Documentation* at Paris does not include the whole of Russia, but only that part which was occupied by German troops. The only persons who know this are those who have read *Le Troisième Reich et les Juifs* by Leon Poliakov, from which these statistics are extracted and in which this particular detail is mentioned. If one reintegrates into the two columns the million Jews that Mr. Poliakov very arbitrarily subtracted, the estimate of survivors differs by exactly *one million* from one to the other for that country, the total number of the exterminated for all countries still differs by a little less than 600,000. Who can say how Mr. Poliakov managed to get the figure, 2,100,000 for the number of Jews living in that part of Russia occupied by German troops; he does not tell us. But, we can be sure that there is no question here of a census evaluation; such a procedure is absolutely impossible on the local level unless that level corresponds to the existing civil administrative districts. Thus, no census could have been made in Russia, because the O.K.W. decided to conquer Russia in accordance with the geographical imperatives of strategy instead of by one administrative district after another. Mr. Poliakov's figure is a purely conjectural evaluation, therefore, and one which seems to assume that the Jews of this region, instead of fleeing before an invasion which they knew was fatal for them, waited nicely in place for the coming of their executioners. Nor can it be said how Mr. Poliakov managed to estimate at 600,000 the number of survivors in 1946, when we can be sure that, with the war over for only a year, order had not been sufficiently reestablished to permit census-taking; obviously, that figure is still another rough estimate! That it showed a loss of 1.5 million was doubtless all that mattered to Mr. Poliakov, and, without doubt, he also worked out ahead of time the result that he was to come to, so that it would harmonize with the legend of the six million. He did not realize that Mr. Raul Hilberg was right behind him!

3. On reading Mr. Raul Hilberg's monograph, we see that he has taken into account the flight of the Jews before the advance of the German armies in Russia. But to what extent does his estimate correspond with reality? That is what we shall see farther on. One must concede, in any case, that when he gives 3,020,000 as the number of Jews living in Russia in 1939, he is in agreement with Mr. Arthur Ruppin; and, when he calculates at 2,600,000 those among them who survived, which gives 420,000 lost, he is also in agreement with the Jewish journalist, David Bergelson, who wrote in *Die Einheit*, on December 5, 1942, that "Thanks to the evacuation, the majority (80%) of the Jews of the Ukraine, White Russia, and Lithuania and Latvia, were saved" (cited from *Der Weg*, Buenos Aires, January 1953). Where Mr. Raul Hilberg is no longer in

agreement is with himself. If, as he says, 2,600,000 Russian Jews were saved, how can he maintain (p. 190) that for Latvia, Lithuania, and Russia only 1.5 million "escaped behind the Russian lines" at the time of the advance of the German troops? And, how can he also maintain, as he does in his own statistics, that not one Latvian Jew survived?

4. Poland: Here the statistics are more or less in agreement on the Jewish population in 1939, but not at all on the number of survivors; 500,000 for one, 50,000 for the other, a ratio of 1 to 10 -- compared to the 1 to 14 of Mr. Salo Baron. We do not know how the *World Center for Contemporary Jewish Documentation* came to this conclusion; there is no reference. As for Mr. Raul Hilberg, he is irretrievably lost in the fog of figures that he builds up around himself. Indeed, we have seen that on page 767 of his book he gives 3,000,000 Polish Jews exterminated, and on page 670, he gives just 50,000 survivors out of 3,350,000; any explanation is superfluous. From what we have seen thus far, we can detect the playing of a little game. These statistics are indiscriminately, and even sometimes simultaneously, supported by the *World Center of Contemporary Jewish Documentation* and various other Zionist organizations and spokesmen. The reader is free to choose between the two and to put himself in the place of one who might find the Jewish population of 1939 as given by the *World Center* at Paris and the number of Jewish survivors in 1945 as given by Mr. Raul Hilberg closer to reality. Or the other way around. In this saraband of figures, anything goes. In the first case we get: 8,297,500 minus 3,782,500 or 4,515,000 victims; and in the second case 9,190,000 minus 2,288,100 or 6,901,900 victims. The result yields quite an impressive difference. By pursuing further this comparison of the two statistics we could doubtless find even more striking anomalies, but to what purpose?

I think that the moment has come to talk of more serious matters, namely, of that migration of the European Jews between 1933 and 1945, to which I have only alluded so far. Because this movement has not been studied in any detail by any of the authors who we have been discussing, it is full of question marks and is susceptible to all kinds of manipulation. If it is true, as the *American Mercury* claims, that the Zionists will not permit a census of world Jewry -- what an admission! -- and that that refusal makes an accurate head count impossible, then they have little ground for complaint if any of my conclusions, which are based upon their own statistics, are wrong; after all, the following study would not have been necessary if there were such a census, since the entire truth would be revealed by it.

IV. The Jewish Migration, or "The Wandering Jew"

In order really to understand the movements of the European Jews from 1933 to 1945, it seems to me that a brief historical survey of Jewish migration is indispensable; in short, a history of the "wandering Jew."

Successively or simultaneously popularized as Cartaphilus, Ahasverus, or Laquedem, depending upon the place and the time, the "wandering Jew" seems to have come into the European tradition in about the thirteenth century. Image and song had characterized him definitely in the eighteenth century in a naive ballad in twenty-four couplets, a "Portrait drawn from nature by the citizens of Brussels, at the time of the

last appearance of the Jew, the 22nd of April, 1774," which in its own way gives an account of one of the oldest and earliest of historical realities: the Jewish migration. One of the oldest, the peregrinations of that branch, considered legitimate, of the descendants of Noah by Sem and Abraham (5), it is, in its legendary and mythical form, the substance of the Old Testament, which dates their first steps back to the no less legendary and mythical Flood. The earliest: coming into history at a very uncertain date but very probably contemporary with the invasion of Egypt by the Hyksos (18th c. B.C.), in any case, between the 20th and the 12th centuries before Christ, when all the other human migrations had long since come to an end. Not only is the Jewish migration not ended, but twenty centuries after Christ it is still being described in the same legendary terms, and still has the same motive power. "The commercial bent of the Jewish people," Otto Heller said (*La Fin du Judaïsme*. Paris: Guilde, 1933), "is of long tradition." In fact, from Sumer, which, if one is to believe the Old Testament, was its first objective, to New York, which seems to be its present objective, the Jewish migration has followed, as have all human migrations, the great natural arteries, but not in the same haphazard way. Rather, the Jews have constantly turned toward those points or regions on the globe which have achieved the highest economic development. That is why, instead of going directly from the East toward the West, like all the other human migrations, this one went in a zig-zag fashion in all directions. That it encountered various misadventures, particularly the hostility it attracted in certain areas it had chosen for expansion, is certain. But these accidents scarcely modified the movement with regard to the ever constant aims. Incidentally, this hostility was never, historically speaking, either systematic or permanent, doubtless because, unlike all the other human migrations, it was itself never massive or aggressive; instead, it was characterized by the suppleness of the professional tradesman. However, there are two exceptions to this historical generalization. In its Biblical phase, during the time when first Saul, then David, and then Solomon tried to settle permanently and by force at the place where the two great commercial arterial routes of their times intersected -- routes that connected Europe and Asia to Africa, that is to say in Palestine --with the hope of living there by extracting a tithe of all the trade obliged to make use of this passage. And today, still in Palestine where international Zionism plans to reconstitute, in the form of a State Bank, the Kingdom of Solomon, since Israel finds itself once again on the most important commercial arterial of the modern world, the one going from New York to New York, around the world via London, Paris, Tel-Aviv, Calcutta, Singapore, Hong-Kong, Shanghai, and Tokyo. In any case, that is what one gets out of a small book, by a certain Kadmi Cohen, a spokesman for international Zionism, which had some fame between the two world wars: *L'Etat d'Israel* (Paris: Kra, 1930). The theme of this book seems to be, although presented in vague terminology so as not to reveal the cloven hoof, that the international Zionist movement should not aim at assembling all of the Jews of the world in a country the size of the Kingdom of Solomon and at organizing them into a modern nation, but only its outer flank, whose task it would be to make it a home-port for a Diaspora which would rationally apportion the riches of the world at the point where they converge, after, naturally, siphoning off a portion for themselves. But, on the scale of the modern world, that would in a way be a repetition of the operation which was realized in the first century B.C., on the scale of the Roman world, which was described by Cicero in his celebrated speech *Pro Flacco*, and which was seen in the periodic shipment, on galleys headed for Judea, of all the gold of that world, which had until then, converted on Rome. If, twice, Rome commissioned Titus (70 A.D.) and then Hadrian (135 A.D.) to destroy the Kingdom of Judea and to disperse

its people throughout the Empire, among other reasons, it had this one: to get back what she considered to be her gold. Until Titus she had been very benevolent toward the Jews, as shown by the Bernice story.

Today, speaking metaphorically, the aim is the gold of Fort Knox. If the plan should succeed -- and all that is needed is for the American branch of international Zionism to get its hand on Wall Street -- the Israeli home-port of the Diaspora would become not only the commercial home of the Atlantic world, but, since oil is the primary source of energy for its development, and control of that would be totally assured from the Middle East to Texas, it would also become the command post of all of the world's industry. "You will earn your bread by the sweat of your brow," the Eternal One said to Adam; and to Eve, "You will give birth in pain," as he chased the couple from the earthly Paradise he had created for them and for their descendants. The women of Israel would, to be sure, continue to bear their children in pain, but their men would earn their bread and that of their children by the sweat of other's brows. Then, at the very least, it could be said that the designation "Chosen People," which the Jews claim for themselves, would assume its full significance.

The chances for this to succeed? In 1932, Mr. Arthur Ruppin (*Les Juifs dans le Monde Moderne, op. cit.*) told us that in 1927 in the United States, the 4,500,000 Jews controlled a substantial number of periodical publications; they can be broken down in this way: 9 dailies, 68 weeklies, 18 monthlies, 16 others. Furthermore, he specified that 65 of these publications came out in English, 41 in Yiddish, 3 in Hebrew, 2 in German, and that the most widely read of the dailies, the New York *Vorwärts*, had a circulation of 250,000. Here it is a question only of the internal press of Judaism, whose aim was solely to maintain homogeneity. No account was taken of Jewish financial participation in the press at large, which Mr. Arthur Ruppin describes as being very significant. And what of this Jewish control of the "mass media" today? We shall see its effect farther on when we take up the significance of the Jewish population in the United States. As for the importance of the internal press of the Zionist movement, I have not one fact which would allow me to estimate it. But it cannot be less than it was in 1927. And, as for the significance of Jewish financial participation in the public press -- as well as in cinema, radio, television, and book publishing -- it will suffice for me to remark that that press publicizes, with remarkable consistency, and assumes responsibility for all the theses of the American Jewish Committee. That these theses are not always in accord with those of the *World Center of Contemporary Jewish Documentation*, and of its subsidiaries, whose propaganda is inspired by Mr. Ben Gurion, is to be accounted for in the political dissension between him and Mr. Nahum Goldmann, who is the inspiration for the American Jewish Committee. The discord between these two men and the two organizations lies only in details and is only barely perceptible in shades of meaning. When it comes to essentials they are always in agreement on the general theme. And their respective adherents follow their example; Mr. Raul Hilberg and Madame Hannah Arendt offer us the best illustration. At the service of Mr. Nahum Goldmann, they credit Auschwitz with one million Jews exterminated (nearly *three million* less than Leon Poliakov, or Olga Wormser, or Henri Michel of the *World Center of Contemporary Jewish Documentation* and its subsidiaries!) and give 950,000 for the five other alleged gas extermination centers (more than *one million* less than the figure given by the World Center group; in all, a margin of error of nearly *four million* out of a total of *six*!) But, when they come to make their additions for the balance

sheet of Jewish losses, they still manage to come to a figure near, or at least on the same sort of scale (this is the shade of meaning in the general theme) as the *six million* of the *World Center of Contemporary Jewish Documentation* and its subsidiaries at the service of Mr. Ben Gurion. The same holds true for the analysis of the Jewish losses by countries, where, depending upon whether you follow the contentions of the American Jewish Committee, as expressed by Mr. Raul Hilberg or by Mr. Salo Baron, or those of the *World Center of Contemporary Jewish Documentation*, as expressed by the Poliakov group, you get a total for survivors which varies from 50,000 to 700,000 for Poland, from 500,000 to 2,600,000 for Russia, from zero to 85,000 for Latvia, and from zero to several millions for each one of a dozen other countries, without the overall figure for losses for all the countries being noticeably affected. All this means that in the general contention, shared by both, that six million Jews more or less were exterminated, these two theses nullify each other when it comes to the details.

But, let us return to our examination of Jewish migration.

Of the accidental historical circumstances which had an influence on the general direction which the Jewish migration took, the most important seem to have been the Babylonian Captivity (588-536 B.C.), the intervention of Titus (70 A.D.) and of Hadrian (135 A.D.), the reactions of Christianity in the Middle Ages (especially from the 13th to the 16th century), the policy of the Russian Czars in the second half of the 19th century, Bolshevism, the, so to speak, atavistic hostility of the Polish people since the end of the First World War, and finally Hitler from 1933 to 1945. However, there were other significant circumstances which were not hostile: since 1850, the progressive assumption of industrial and commercial world leadership by the United States has been a positive factor which has been decisive in orienting the actual migration of the Jews, and in accelerating the orientation. 'The figures are revealing: 230,000 Jews in the United States in 1877; 475,000 in 1890; 1,775,000 in 1906; 3,300,000 in 1916; 4,081,000 in 1926; 4,461,184 in 1936, according to Mr. John Beaty (*The Iron Curtain over America*, p. 41), who claims to be citing from various official censuses of the American populations (6). And, that means that during these sixty years the Jewish population of the United States has multiplied more than twenty-fold, a veritable invasion. However, it is true that during these sixty years, it is not only Jews who have been drawn to the United States. In 1936, the date of the last official statistics which are referred to by Mr. John Beaty, out of a total population of 128 million, there were about 115 million whites. Among these 115 million, approximately 33 million were either foreign-born or of the first generation of foreign-born. These sixty years corresponded to what we in Europe call the *Gold Rush*, which was first set in motion in 1848 by the discovery of gold in California and which laid the foundation for the extraordinary development of San Francisco. It was really an "Industrial Rush" in the United States after 1877.

In 1926 the Germans, or descendants of Germans, made up the largest ethnic or national group in the United States with 7,250,000; the English were next with 5 million; then came the Irish with 4 million; and the Italians with 3,500,000. However, with its 4,081,000 individuals, the Jewish group was the one which was, with regard to its world-wide importance, by far the strongest contingent. It must also be noted that while the other groups settled in the United States between 1850 and 1900, the Jews only began to arrive in large numbers about 1900, particularly after 1906, and,

as the statistics show, they were mostly Russian and Polish in origin; those who were not were almost all German. It seems that one can associate the beginnings of the massive migration of the Jews to the United States with two events, contemporary with it: (1) the setback of Theodore Herzl (who died in 1904) in his attempt to found a Jewish state in Palestine, which was especially of concern to the Russian and Polish Jews who were victims of periodic pogroms, and (2) the first steps taken by the United States to establish immigration quotas (1917-1924) which, according to the figures cited above, make it clear that the immigration of the Jews was largely clandestine after 1917. One quickly gets an idea of what it has been since that date. No error is risked in saying that the Russian, Polish, and German Jews have lost no ground since the beginning of the century, and that, especially between 1933 and 1945, their immigration was not any the less clandestine in spite of the existence of the National Origins Law of 1924 which, observing how Jews in Europe were being persecuted, was never brought -- to the honor of America -- into effect against them during this period, although in theory this law was never officially repealed.

If every time the Jewish problem has arisen in the world it has been stirred up by Russian, Polish, and German Jews -- at least -- it is due to the shattering intervention of Titus and Hadrian in Palestine, an intervention which displaced what one might call the center of gravity, or nutrient reservoir, of the Jewish migration in the European triangle lying between the mouths of the Volga, the Danube, and the Vistula. Mistreated as they were by Rome, the refugees from the massacres were scarcely drawn to Egypt, also Roman, as their fathers had been in the time of Herod; they preferred to work their way beyond the *limes*, most of them by way of the Caucasus, with the rest going to settle in Babylon, which had earlier been assigned to their ancestors by Nebuchadnezzar during the time of the Captivity (6th c. B.C.). In the tolerant reign of the Arsacides, the latter formed a sort of vassal state which, from the third to the fifth century, intellectually illuminated the entire Jewish world through its theological academies of Sora, Pumbedita and Hahardea. There, and during that epoch, the so-called Babylonian Talmud was codified. But that branch progressively joined with the larger migration and was incorporated within it.

Had their Palestine experience taught them a lesson? Very likely. The fact remains that all the writers who have described or commented upon these events are agreed on this point: the Jews were very well received on the other side of the Caucasus by the autochthonous peoples among whom they appeared as the bearers of a new religion to whose proselytism they yielded. As they made converts among these people so did they mingle with them, and they rapidly swarmed into the area between the mouth of the Danube and that of the Volga; then, clever merchants as they had remained, they were drawn to the Baltic Sea, and they soon occupied a triangle formed with the mouth of the Vistula, through which necessarily passed all the land routes, highways and rivers, which contributed to the trade between continental Europe and Asia, via the Black Sea and the Caspian.

Caracalla did away with the measures taken against them by Titus and Hadrian. Consequently, during the whole of the third century and until Constantine, who persecuted them again (beginning of the fourth century), their commercial progress was favored by the normalization of their relations with their co-religionists who were still in the Empire, and they too appeared as the bearers of a standard of living, until then unknown to the barbarian peoples of those regions, which attracted the native

population as much as, if not more than, their religion did. With conversion and intermarriage contributing, the two or three tens of thousands of Jews, who fleeing before the soldiers of Titus and Hadrian had crossed the Caucasus, had become by the Middle Ages hundreds of thousands, living in trading communities closed to the uninitiated, whose synagogues were at the same time the cement and the keystone, but whose ethnic formation was quite different from the original group. On the eve of the war of 1939, there were several million of the Ashkenazim in world Jewry, as compared to the Sephardim, descendants of those who had gone into western Europe along the shores of the Mediterranean, without mingling with the autochthonous populations of the countries they went through and who had kept their original ethnic type.

I shall take advantage of the opportunity here presented to say that from the Ashkenazim to the Sephardim, world Jewry of the twentieth century is composed of men and women of an infinity of types, very clearly distinguishable in their somatic characteristics -- there are even yellow and black Jews! -- who are united only by a religion, customs, a way of life, or, to sum it up, a tradition which is the binding element made up of a singleness of viewpoint and a solidarity that survives all strains, but which is not of the kind that defines a race in the biological sense that we give to the word. By giving a racial character to their struggles, both Hitler and Ben Gurion committed the same error: that of the latter in wanting, in the creation of the State of Israel, not only to save men, but to save a type of man who no longer exists, if he ever did; that of the former in wanting to protect from intermarriage by that imaginary man a German society which he labeled the Germanic type, but which racially was no more than the Israeli society is Jewish. With regard to its population, this is what Mr. Ben Gurion's State of Israel is: a conglomeration of human types from the Yemenite Jew influenced by the Arab, to the German Jew mixed with the German type, and the Russian, Rumanian or Hungarian Jew infiltrated by the Slav; in short, Israel is populated with all of these types which have few or no somatic characteristics in common. The only things that the Zionist movement can hope for from so anomalous a group are, ethnically or racially speaking, the evolution of a new type of Jewish human being, issuing from a long series of mixtures of all these types, insofar as they consent to be mixed, and, politically speaking, the development of a theological state, a community in its most archaic form, which would correspond with the intellectual level of that community, perhaps very high in religious or mystic qualities but certainly very low, or backward, from the philosophical point of view. So, we see that for peoples as primitive as the Yemen Jews -- together with whom it is proposed to merge into one single people all the Jews of the world in the land of their ancestors, a land much less common to them all than they claim -- international Zionism is not held with the same insurmountable aversion which, ever since Theodore Herzl held it over the baptismal fountain, it has experienced among the peoples of the highest European civilizations. It is commonly known with what stubborn indignation international Zionism has constantly rejected the ideas of the greatest Jewish philosopher of all times, Moses Mendelssohn (1729-1786), who, wanting to put an end to Jewish Apartheid, preached the assimilation of the Jews with the peoples among whom they lived. The reason why his ideas are opposed is that, in trying to raise Judaism above the level of religion and racial myths to the level of philosophy, the ideas of Moses Mendelssohn would have meant, if they had been seriously considered, the end of the Rabbinate, a convenient screen behind which was created, and has prospered ever since, the most vast and ambitious commercial

enterprise of all time. Threatened with extinction, or, at the least, with a diminution of its profits, by a society greatly enlarged by the assimilation of the Jews with the civilized Europeans, this commercial enterprise runs no risk at all by merging with the Yemenite Jews on Israeli territory. But, one shudders to think what this future Jewish type would be, with Judaism now proliferating among the blacks and Yellows as it has proliferated in Europe.

As seen from the same angle, Hitler's Germany was quite similar: a society of people of an infinity of types, in which the German type, characterized by a blend, in one person, of considerable height, dolichocephalic head, and deficient pigmentation (pale skin, blond hair), represented only a very small minority. "Between 1874 and 1877," Pierre Gaxotte (*Histoire de l'Allemagne*, Paris, 1963, Vol. I, p. 21) says, "a study made in German schools involving about six million children, showed only 31% were blond. Other studies show that the north Germans, whom tradition calls as the best preserved type, are only 18% dolichocephalic." Let the Germans not be disturbed. A comparable study to determine, for example, the Celtic type in the French population would give the same sort of results. In western Europe, where the population is a millenary brew of all the migrations meeting there and of the killing of each other off, there is no homogeneous people, anthropologically speaking, not even a type of any one of the migrations which could be called representative of any majority, or perfectly preserved. Even granting that it is possible to define the original Jewish type with as much accuracy as the German or Celtic type, it is very probable that if the same sort of studies were made in world-wide Jewish societies, roughly the same results would be obtained. The Sephardim Jews, who are surely the closest to that original type, do not, in any case, represent more than a tiny minority. And, this shows how far both Hitler and Ben Gurion went astray in the battle with a myth, at the racial level, at least. There is no doubt but that twentieth century humanity is faced with a racial problem: the relations that can or should exist between the white race and the colored races. It is a problem that exists both on a physical level and on an intellectual level and that is a little bit more in harmony with the facts of modern anthropological science. But, concerning the Jews especially, it is not a race that today they represent, but a way of life and its aspirations. And, it is not a racial problem that they pose, as the State of Israel proves so well, but an economic and social problem, of such dimensions that, under the wing of a tradition that is essentially religious, it envisages the setting up of a mercantile feudal system, which, as we have said, would take in the whole world.

To return to the Jewish migration at its beginning, we must first say that the greatest impact on Western Europe was made by the Ashkenazim Jews, by far the most numerous, and that is the case today in the United States. From Constanza via the Danubian artery, which was about their only access to the West until about the eleventh century, and from Warsaw via countries touched by Hanseatic trade (which could not fail to attract them!), which later became a secondary route, they gradually worked their way to the major Rhone-Rhine artery, uniting the North Sea and the Mediterranean. Certainly England interested them at the time of the Hanseatic League, but more especially after the discovery of America. Mention must be made of Spain and the French Midi, regions that attracted their coreligionists who had remained within the Roman Empire after the loss of its western provinces (fourth century) and after the discriminatory measures against them were reintroduced by Constantine, which measures were not imposed in the eastern regions except

progressively as those areas were detached from the Empire and, then, definitively upon their fall and conquest by the Turks (fifteenth century). This was the branch of the migration that worked its way to western Europe along the shores of the Mediterranean. At the moment when America was discovered, this spearhead of Judaism -- or rather, what was left of it, since in the meantime the Inquisition had made inroads into it -- found itself on the Madrid-London line where the new commercial centers were relocated, since commerce that was once Euro-Asian now had become global in scope.

In that part of western Europe that was free of the Roman Emperors, it seems that the first violent reactions against the Jews can be dated from the tenth century (7). But it was also in the tenth century that the influence of the Christian church, which was sanctioned by Charlemagne and which the Crusades established as the most important spiritual force, began to be felt a little everywhere. Struck by this coincidence, most historians have perceived these violent reactions as being attributable to Christianity, the word being used in the sense of Christianity. The Inquisition -- and, there is a tendency to forget that it was aimed not only at Jews, but at all heresies, and so it absolutely cannot be said to have been inspired with antisemites or racist feelings -- which was rampant in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries in Spain and the south of France confirmed them in this view. It is true that the Church did not like Jews: against them was held, not their race (because in spite of everything it must be recognized that one of the historic invariables of its doctrine is that even in its most obscurantist undertakings, it was always universalist and never looked at the heresies of men except in relation to dogma), but what it considered the greatest of all crimes, the crucifixion of the Christ. The hostility of the western European peoples toward the Jews was manifested much earlier than the period when the Christian Church exerted its influence on them, and it seems that it had its origins in the nature of the communities that the Jews formed as they worked their way toward the west and in the manner in which, through trade and usury, they drained toward themselves all of the cash wealth of the regions where they settled. Also, for fear of falling into Jewish hands and finding themselves dispossessed, the burgeoning system of Feudalism forbade them, whom they accused of exploiting the people, to become owners of landed wealth. Even before Christianity was talked about, the Roman Patriciate had shown the same defensive reaction against them. Thus, it seems legitimate to me to think that the Christian Church only added religious reasons to those that were essentially economic of Feudalism or of the Roman Patriciate, and not the other way around. If this way of looking at the problem were justified, what I call a confusion on the Part of the historians would not be important except insofar as it determines the original cause of anti-Jewish reactions among Europeans in the Middle Ages. Indeed, it would very well explain things: on the one hand, just when the first of these reactions was noted, the European consciousness was that of being, not European, a politically unknown idea at that time, but Christian, and Christendom stood against paganism, which was synonymous with barbarity; on the other hand, it was the Church, Catholic or Reformed, which led the struggle against the Jews and either claimed this honor in its fight against heretics, or endowed those who imputed "heresy" as a crime with the responsibility of carrying on the struggle. But, that is a problem for Mandarins: whatever the hypothesis, the tangible reality for the Jews, from the tenth to the sixteenth century, was that in all Christendom they were, in one place or another, periodically stripped of their wealth, which they were reputed to have acquired in a wrongful way, by the princes, the kings, or the emperors, all with

the blessing or at the instigation of the Church, which was in on the division of the spoils. The procedure was simple: confiscation of goods together with prison or exile. And, the excuse was always the same: usury, or the profaning of a place or object of piety, or both. One can even cite numerous cases of the bourgeoisie -- since they were very dangerous competitors for them -- accusing the Jews of some profanation or other before the ecclesiastical authorities in order to get them imprisoned, and thus to escape their debts to them.

Doubtless, the worst period for the Jews was during the twelfth, fourteenth, and fifteenth centuries (8), during which time they surged back to eastern Europe, which remained fairly liberal toward them, since conversions to Judaism were constantly being registered. Indeed, it was only later, as the Orthodox religion gained ground in these regions and as the idea of the Empire of all the Russias was born, that the hostility toward the Jews was born which was to manifest itself in far more terrible forms than in the West -- the word *pogrom* is from the Russian vocabulary. In the West it was the advent of Humanism that brought the first alleviations in the condition of the Jews, and it was the Encyclopedists who dealt the decisive blow to the hostility against them. The French Revolution made them citizens like everyone else (1791), and this practice spread in Europe: Prussia (1812), the Germanic Confederation (1848), England (1858), Italy (1870). But, the era of "*pogroms*" had begun in "all the Russias". Migration toward the west swelled again, until in the second half of the nineteenth century it brought about the appearance of the word *anti-Semitism* in all the dictionaries, and anti-Semitism itself -- however, wrongly, as has been said -- in all national policies.

It was in the second half of the nineteenth century that the first significant numbers of Jews crossed the Atlantic, attracted by the Gold Rush and by the dynamic industrialization of the American economy -- where, deriving mainly from "all the Russias" including Poland, and from Germany, the Jews who had spent more than twenty centuries, according to their own Statistics, growing to a little more than ten million in the rest of the world, needed only sixty years to approach five million in the United States.

In the twentieth century, the Russian Revolution, the general Policy of Poland, especially from the time in 1932 when Colonel Beck began to play a role in it, and finally Hitler hastened the movement of Jews toward the United States, and only those who lacked the means to get there remained behind in Holland, Belgium, England and France. Some of them tried to reach the "Jewish national hearth," created in Palestine by the Balfour Commission (on November 2, 1917), and succeeded in doing so, in spite of the hostility of England, which had fixed entry quotas. But the United States was the attraction *par excellence*. In 1928, the Policy of Stalinist Russia, while hardly benevolent towards the Jews, still wanted to keep them within the frontiers. These borders, the gates to the exit to the west, were closed to them, as they were closed to all Russians. The area of Birobidjan, located on the borders of Manchuria, was set up and placed at their disposal as an autonomous territory in the heart of the USSR. Stalin very quickly saw that although the number of Jews in the Ukraine and White Russia was diminishing, it was not increasing in Birobidjan, where they were nevertheless making their way, but only to reach a frontier close to China, where with the connivance of the Chinese, who at that time were hostile to the USSR, they were able to flee the Soviet regime. From there, via Hong Kong and Shanghai, they went to

the United States, which, with the connivance of those who had gone there before them and who had become politically quite powerful, they were entering clandestinely. Just before the Second World War began no one in Russia, nor in the rest of the world, was talking any more about the Jewish autonomous territory of Birobidjan. During the war the matter was almost brought up again, in circumstances which will be described. For the moment, it is enough to say that in making the Jews take the Siberian route again - "Central Asia" as it was called by those fresh from Russia -- a significant consistency was given to their migration toward the United States by way of the East.

V. The Movement of the European Jewish Population from 1933 to 1945

In 1933, the staging area for the Jewish migration, or, if you prefer, its supply area, was no longer the triangle marked by the mouths of the Vistula, Danube and Volga. There had been successively added to those Danubian countries in which political instability and trouble following the First World War had stirred them to leave the nations of Germany, Austria, and Czechoslovakia. And, since 1917 (Balfour Convention) besides the United States, there was a second destination point: Palestine.

In spite of the confusion that has been systematically created by various leaders of the Zionist movement around the period of this migration, a certain number of facts are positively known and irrefutably established which mark the routes that were made use of by the Jews and which definitely destroy the thesis of the extermination of six million Jews. Furthermore, it is international Zionism itself -- which by its policy with regard to Germany and with regard especially to the numerous trials, that have become almost incalculable, which it unceasingly demands against the Germans to prove again and again that these six million were really exterminated -- that has revealed most of these facts to us (if we did not already know them) or has confirmed their actuality (if we only had suspected their existence). An incalculable number of trials calls for an even more incalculable number of witnesses to give weight to the accusations and of journalists to report the hearings; and, it was fatal that among them should be found blunderers like Mr. Salo Baron (a professor at Columbia University and a witness at the Eichmann trial who, on top of everything else, had actually seen nothing!) or like Hannah Arendt (a journalist assigned to cover the same trial by the *New Yorker* who will be discussed elsewhere) to give the game away. It was no less fatal that there arrived at the bar of the Tribunal of History, Mr. Raul Hilberg and that he should make use of all of these in such a way that not only was everything that had been said earlier reduced to contradictions, but even that which he said himself. "He who tries too hard to prove . . ." as the proverb says.

All of these facts which have set us on the path to historical truth, have been made positively known and have been irrefutably established, unfortunately, only by specialists, most of whom, out of indifference or political interest, have suppressed them or have tried -- as we have seen, and as we shall see again, with regard to the facts concerning the international Zionist movement -- to keep them out of sight. I am among those who, out of respect for my profession and submission to the moral imperatives proper to it, attach great importance to their becoming known to the public at large. I am also concerned that this very lack of information might tend to lead societies in their evolution toward impasses and catastrophes. It is because

governmental policies are based generally on conjectures, more often than not elaborated in the personal interests of the politicians who proclaim them and not with regard to established truths, that societies are periodically thrown into these impasses and precipitated into these catastrophes. Consequently, there lies the necessity for finding out and for establishing, for the benefit of the mass of honest people, those truths which will permit them to defend themselves against the interested undertakings of the politicians.

Historians tell us that history is learned by tracing its course through time and, then, is verified by tracing it back again. The police, in their jargon, express this idea by saying that it is by "tracing every clue to its source," not by following every clue, that the truth is discovered. Since it is a question of verifying a statistic, therefore an addition, let us borrow the language of the mathematicians who in accounting teach that in order to verify an addition, it must be done from bottom to top, or inversely to the way that it was done in the first place. The top, in this case, is the area where the Jewish migration started. And, Europe, where it took place, is a forest of testimonies giving only partial views of events which are all overlapped and, which in addition, are falsified by the constituent elements of the psychology of the witnesses. It was from the top that the Zionist historians and statisticians began to total their deaths, pretending, because that is the way they wanted it to be, not to see that the sum which they obtained could only be infinitely reduced, just as a landscape would be enlarged to infinity by placing end to end all of the partial photographs taken of it, without first having removed from each all of the overlapping elements figuring in others. The views of the witnesses overlap just as do the photographs, and a landscape in nature is no more the sum of the latter, retouched by topographers, than a historical landscape is the sum of the former uncounted by historians. Until a general accounting is made, everything will remain confused, uncertain, and conjectural, in the very places where the events took place. However, it does not seem as though such an accounting is likely to be done in the near future given the absurd "fifty years' rule," or whatever else suits the politicians. Until that period is passed, if historians are nevertheless tempted to clarify the circumstances of that drama -- and the urgent need for an assault against the historic myth presses them every day -- they will be forced to proceed by successive stages from the established facts. And, it is in that context that this study is inscribed.

At the bottom of the addition are the two destination points of the migration, the United States and Israel, where, on the other hand, almost everything is known, although obscured by what one might call after the title of a recent film, the *Night and Fog* of Zionist propaganda. To take the advice of the historians and trace history back, or that of the policemen and trace every clue to its source, or that of the mathematician and go over the addition means to take an inventory of the Jewish population of the world, starting with what it is today in the United States and Israel. The method offers the signal advantage of obeying the basic rule of all scientific investigations: to proceed from the known to the unknown and, thereby, to shed light on the unknown by means of the known. I shall begin with a census of Israel first.

In 1926. Mr. Arthur Ruppin tells us that there were 250,000 Jews in Palestine. But the official statistics of the State of Israel as reproduced by Mr. Andre Chouraqui (*L'Etat d'Israel*, p. 62) tell us that there were only 150,000 in 1927, and 174,610 in 1931, the eve of the coming to power of Beck in Poland and of Hitler in Germany. Since this

study attempts to show that, aside from the fact that they do not agree with each other, all statistics of Jewish origin published after the war do not agree with those published by Mr. Arthur Ruppin before the war, and, taken as a base of *reference*, one must, if one is to make useful comparisons with the latter, first know exactly what the former have to say about the evolution of the Jewish population in Israel. And for the period after 1931 this is what Mr. Andre Chouraqui has to tell them: 1947 -- 629,000; 1952 -- 1,450,000; 1957 -- 1,763,000.

On the level reached in 1962 we have, on the other hand, two bits of information, perhaps contestable but at least in agreement, of which the first is already known to the reader: the communiqué of March 31, 1963, of the *Institute for Jewish Affairs* of London, published on April 1 by *Die Welt* of Hamburg in which it is said that that population had reached 2.045 million;(9) and a speech given on July 17, 1963, before the *Knesseth* (the Israeli Parliament) by Mr. Levi Eshkol (successor of Mr. Ben Gurion) in which it is said that out of a total of 2.27 million inhabitants in the State of Israel, 2.05 million were Jews. We shall assume that Mr. Levi Eshkol, President of the Council of the State of Israel, is very probably better informed than the *Institute for Jewish Affairs* of London, and we shall retain his figure. In any case with a difference of only 5,000 it is without importance.

Here we are presented with four significant dates in the evolution of the Israeli population: 1931 (just before the rise to Power of Beck in Poland and Hitler in Germany); 1947 and 1952 (the eve and the day after the creation of the State of Israel); and finally 1962 (the year in which this study was written).

In order to determine the importance of Jewish immigration into Israel from 1931 to 1962, a third factor is missing, the normal rate of increase of the world Jewish population. Now, Mr. Salo Baron supplied us with one when on April 23, 1961, he came before the bar of the Jerusalem Tribunal to state that in relation to what it had been in 1945 this population had increased by twenty per cent.

However, "one swallow does not make a summer." I categorically refuse to accept such an estimate as being well founded. A normal rate of increase of twenty per cent over sixteen years amounts in fact to an annual increase of about 1.25 per cent, that is, of the world population, which demographers estimate will double every 80 years at its present rate of proliferation. But, this rate is reached only in the eightieth year. What it is in the 16th year does not seem to have been calculated, or if it has, I do not know about it. What is certain is that it is much less. The population of France, which, it seems, proliferates at the world rate, has, for example, gone from a little less than 42 million to a little more than 46 million during these sixteen years, or at a global rate of increase of 10 per cent, or annually about .62 per cent. During the same period, the Italian population, which proliferates at a faster rate than the world rate, still has not gone from more than a little more than 43 million to a little less than 50 million, or a global rate of 14 per cent, annually about .89 per cent. The United States seem similarly to have gone from 141 million to 186 million, that is a global rate of about 12 per cent, annually about .75 per cent, but there we must reckon with a significant immigration which the legislative measures of 1901 to 1924 failed to block.

And, what about the world Jewish population? First of all, using the demographers' scale of eighty years, and of the century, this is what Professor Salo Baron's estimate produces, facts which most surely cannot be admitted:

16th year...10 million...plus. 20%...equal...12 million (+1.25% per year)

32nd year...12 million...plus. 20%...equal...14.4 million (+ 1.37% per year)

48th year...14.4 million...plus. 20%...equal...17.28 million (+1.51% per year)

64th year...17.28 million...plus. 20%...equal...20.76 million (+1.68% per year)

80th year...20.76 million...plus. 20%...equal...24.83 million (+1.86% per year)

96th year...24.83 million...plus. 20%...equal...29.86 million (+2.06% per year)

Baron's figures show that, more than doubled after the 64th year, the world Jewish population would be more than tripled after the 96th year. This projection is like saying that the Jews are, if not more, at least as prolific as the Chinese, a fact which is not attested to by all their other information on the subject.

In the absence of any verified information concerning the Jews, I examined the normal annual rate of increase, which would be applicable to them, and I arrived at the following conclusions:

- a. The world Jewish population is always in a state of migration.
- b. Migrating populations increase proportionately less than sedentary populations.
- c. A sedentary population which doubles every 80 years reaches an annual rate of about 1 per cent after the 64th year.
- d. But we are concerned with the periods between 1931 and 1962, and the calculations cannot include more than 31 years, and should be 16, or 10 or 5 or 4, which means that the 1 per cent annual rate of increase, if used in the calculations, would give the Jews, migrating, a higher rate than sedentary Italians, all things being normal. However, let us retain the 1 per cent, on the principle of the benefit of the doubt.

The method of calculation: the natural growth of a population is the difference between the number of births and the number of deaths. If we are able to determine the natural increase in each of the great waves of the four important dates of Jewish immigration into Israel, it should suffice to subtract that from the Jewish population of the State of Israel in 1962, to add the number of deaths there to the result obtained, and to arrive at the actual number of immigrants for the period 1931 - 1962. In this particular case account must be taken of those who, disappointed in the venture, left again, and their number should be added. An analysis of these factors -- natural growth, immigration, mortality among immigrants, and emigration -- follows:

1. Natural growth: (10)

- a. from 1931 to 1962, the 174,610 counted in Palestine in 1931, have grown by 31 % or 54,129 persons.
- b. from 1947 to 1962, the 629,000 counted in 1947 have grown by 15% or 94,350 persons.
- c. from 1952 to 1962, the 1,450,000 counted in 1952 have grown by 10% or 145,000 persons.

To this must be added the natural increase of:

- a. those 629,000 Jews counted in 1947 who arrived in Israel between 1931 and 1947;
- b. those 1,450,000 counted in 1952, who arrived between 1947 and 1952;
- c. those 2,050,000 counted in 1962 who arrived between 1952 and 1962.

Here are the results obtained from the second series of calculations, organized along the elementary rules of arithmetic:

- a. from 1931 to 1947, the 174,610 Jews counted in 1931 have increased by 16% and have become: $(174,610 \times 116)/100 = 202,547$. It follows that, with their natural increase included, the new arrivals in this period represent 629,000 minus 202,547 or 426,453, and, their natural increase itself; $(426,453 \times 16)/116 = 58,821$.
- b. from 1947 to 1952, the 629,000 Jews counted in 1947, grew by 5% and were: $(629,000 \times 105)/100 = 660,450$. It follows that, with their natural increase included, the new arrivals during that period represent 1,450,000 minus 660,450 or 789,550, and their natural growth itself $(789,550 \times 5)/105 = 37,598$.
- c. from 1952 to 1962, the 1,450,000 Jews counted in 1952 increased by 10%, thus: $(1,450,000 \times 110)/100 = 1,595,000$. It follows that, including their natural increase, the new arrivals during this period represent 2,050,000 minus 1,595,000 or 455,000, and their natural growth itself $(455,000 \times 10)/110 = 41,364$.

The preceding figures give a total natural increase of 431,262.

2. Actual number of immigrants during this period (not adjusted for on the spot mortality). To obtain this number one must not only subtract this figure from the Jewish population of the State of Israel in 1962, but also the 174,610 persons counted in 1931, who are included, which gives 2,050,000 minus (431,262 plus 174,610) equal 1,444,128.(11)

3. On the spot mortality among the immigrants. Jewish sources are not very exhaustive on the death rate, and not on the birth rate either, at least to my knowledge. Concerning the latter one finds from time to time data of this sort: "The average number of children per family is 3.8" (*L'Etat d'Israel*, Andre Chouraqui, p. 77) which is meaningless. As for the death rate, also from time to time, some journalists now and then will give a figure: 13, 14 and sometimes as low as 10 per 1 000. Specialists of Salo Baron's caliber are fascinated by the natural rate of increase only, and they establish it on the level of the world Jewish population, not in terms of the number of births and deaths, but in terms of the representation that they wish to present to the world for the two dates, 1946 and 1962, after having first subtracted the six million exterminated. It is a rate subject to political pressures, and fluctuations, as we have seen. The Israeli Jewish population is a young population; in all migrations, it is the young who leave, and the old who remain. For example, in Buchenwald, where Jews were interned, I do not remember having encountered one who was less than 50 years old. Among the peoples of Western Europe the death rate is about 17 per 1000. That it lies between 13 and 14 in Israel is probable. But, in 1946, 1947, and 1948, there were consequences of the war which raised it a little for the whole period. So, let us say about 14 per thousand, or about 20,504. In any case, if I miscalculate it cannot be by more than a few thousand at most, and I am prepared to make corrections. Thus, with mortality included, the immigration between 1931 and 1962 totaled 1,464,632 persons.

4. Emigration. There were those Jews who were disappointed with the "promised land" and there were also those who thought of Palestine, afterward Israel, as a way station imposed by circumstances, from which to proceed elsewhere. (12) Until 1939, for example, a certain number of Polish, Russian, or German Jews, as well as others, did not have the financial means to proceed further. Some, for that reason, even could not go beyond North Africa, in view of the limitation that England put on immigration to Palestine. Between 1939 and 1945 Palestine became, for those who continued to escape secretly either via Istanbul or Constanza, the only accessible refuge. For those who were pushed across the Urals and the Volga by the German armies, a considerable number who even in 1962 have not all succeeded in getting out of Soviet territory, Israel is still the most accessible refuge, unless they are nearer to China; those nearer to China go through Hong Kong and Shanghai to reach the United States. Well, Mr. Andre Chouraqui tells us that "95 out of every hundred immigrants manage to overcome the difficulties of adapting to the country and found families there, while 5 give up." (*op. cit.*, p. 75). Very few, but we will not argue the point. Therefore, the total immigration between 1931 and 1962 is determined by the following calculation:

$$(1,464,632 \times 100)/95 = 1,541,718$$

And now, a last step before finishing with Israel: to take into consideration those among these 1,541,718 immigrants who came from Europe. Here we are furnished with an estimate by Mr. Andre Chouraqui:

Asia, since 1948, furnished Israel with 258,181 immigrants, representing 28.8% of the total immigration. These 258,181 persons came from Turkey (34,797), Iraq (122,987), Iran (31,274), Yemen (45,887); Syria, Lebanon, Aden, even India and China furnished a contingent of 14,092 souls. Africa is third in line (24.8%) after Europe (43.4%), and Asia (28.8%), and supplied a

contingent of 222,806 immigrants representing 24.8% of the recent immigration. North Africa, leading the African contingent, supplied more than 150,000 immigrants originating mainly from Morocco and Tunisia. (*op. cit.* p. 65.)

The data given in the preceding quotation are dated December 31, 1957. From this excerpt the following conclusions can be drawn:

First, the nonsensical style in which this information is written throws doubt on the authenticity of the percentage of the immigrants of African origin, presented in one sentence as a proportion of the total immigration, and in the next as a proportion of the "recent immigration." And, so it can be assumed that other percentages are no more authentic or more significant.

Second, the three per cent of the immigrants who are not accounted for in this enumeration, and we don't know whether they are a portion of the total immigration or of the "recent immigration," concern the American and Australian continents. It is, however, exact enough to show that very few Jews came from those two continents.

Third, except for those Jews from Yemen, whose well known odyssey could be the subject of a novel of dark humor, (13) all the other immigrants taken into account by Mr. Andre Chouraqui could be either Jews who left Europe after 1931, or their descendants born in Africa or in Asia. Please note that I say "could be" and not "were." Palestine, for example, is in Asia, and all those who arrived in Israel from the non-Israeli parts after 1948 could be considered as having originated from Asia, in Mr. Andre Chouraqui's data. Such an interpretation is all right for those born there, but what about their parents? Turkey, Iraq, Iran, Syria, Lebanon, are also in Asia, and it is precisely those countries which were before and during the war most accessible to the European Jews. Often, those countries were the only ones. Some got to Africa via France, particularly until 1939, and the same argument could be made about them. Put yourself in the place of the Polish Jew who left his country in 1932 or 1939: he could not get to Israel before 1948 since a country by that name did not exist, and in most cases he got there only after 1948, often very long after, with the children he had meanwhile had, that is, after having spent fifteen or sixteen years or more in Palestine, Iraq, Syria, Algeria, Tunisia or Morocco, and, if asked whence he came, there is nothing astonishing if he named the country he last lived in, since cosmopolitanism is one of the characteristics of the Jewish soul. It is a long time since he was Polish, if he even remembers it. For him, Poland where he was born was never a native land, but only a "land of welcome," an expression used by Jews the world over to designate the country in which they live, even if they were born there, when they speak among themselves. To his mind, Poland has become the country which treated him badly, and his true "land of welcome" is where he took refuge when he was obliged to leave Poland. And, the same holds for all those who, between the years 1939 and 1945, succeeded in leaving clandestinely not only Poland but also Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Bulgaria, Rumania, and Russia, and who have only arrived in Israel in the last few years. Mr. Andre Chouraqui takes up only immigration into Israel; that factor is all that interests him, and that is his right. That is the subject he treats and he cannot be reproached for limiting himself to his subject. But, it is a very convenient limitation: he can reduce at will the number of European Jews who have immigrated to Israel by having them come from their last residence before 1948 -- pardon, from

their last "land of welcome" -- which was Africa or Asia. And, at the same time, he can increase the number of those who were allegedly exterminated. To what extent has that subterfuge been used? The principal element of the answer to that question is given in the following paragraphs.

Finally, Mr. André Chouraqui's book is dated 1959, and the things described therein date from 1957, as I said. Now, he tells us, in 1957 "Asia, since 1948, furnished Israel with 258,181 immigrants representing 28.8% of the total immigration" up to December 31, 1957. Hence, a simple calculation yields the following: $(258,181 \times 100)/28.8 = 896,462$. This figure of 896,462, then, represents the total immigration through the end of 1957 -- according to Mr. Andre Chouraqui

But again, the Israeli Jewish population went from 1,763,000 on December 31, 1957 (Andre Chouraqui, *op. cit.*, p. 74, and the official statistics for that year) to 2,050,000 on December 31, 1962, which indicates an increase of 287,000, which, after deducting the natural increase, represents 159,381 new immigrants (14) during that period of five years. Since there was a total of 1,541,718 immigrants on December 31, 1962, there were 1,382,337 ($1,541,718 - 159,381$) already there. And, based on his own figures, Mr. Andre Chouraqui's error, I mean the coefficient of minimization, is about 1.54.

Another example of Chouraqui's erroneous analysis is provided by the immigration of Moroccan and Tunisian Jews who, he tells us, rallied to Israel to the number of 150,000. But, let us have a look. In Morocco, Mr. Arthur Ruppin told us, they numbered 120,000 in 1926, and in Tunisia 60,000. Total for both countries is 180,000. In 1948 there must have been 219,600, adjusting for a natural increase in population. If 150,000 of them went over to Israel, there remained at that date 69,600. And, these in 1962 had become 79,344. However, the study by the *Jewish Communities of the World* instructs us that in 1962 there remained 125,000 Jews in Morocco and 35,000 in Tunisia, which gives a total of 160,000. *The Jewish Post Weekly* of April 19, 1963, confirms this. Consequently, it appears that 80,656, of the Jews listed as Moroccan and Tunisian by Mr. Andre Chouraqui were not such; rather, they were the ones who had come from Europe earlier and had not been able to proceed farther for personal or other reasons. Therefore, the actual number of Moroccans or Tunisians (which is achieved by subtracting 80,656 from 150,000) was 69,344. Here it is a question of a coefficient of exaggeration (it is the same thing, this manipulation of figures in both ways having no other object than to augment the number of those exterminated in Europe and to diminish the number of those who succeeded in leaving), and it is from 1 to 2.16 exactly.

Another example, as is seen from Chouraqui's treatment of the German Jews. "The German Jews," says Mr. Andre Chouraqui (*op. cit.*, p. 66), "were *almost totally exterminated* by the Nazis." Now however, we know, and all the Jewish historians and statisticians agree, including Mr. Andre Chouraqui himself, that out of the 500,000 given by Mr. Arthur Ruppin as living in Germany in 1926, or the 540,000 given by postwar Jewish statistics for the number living there in 1933, about 300,000 left the country between 1933 and 1939, and that 40,000, according to Mr. Poliakov and the *Center of Contemporary Jewish Documentation*, or 80,000 according to Mr. Raul Hilberg were still alive in 1945. Hence, the total number of survivors is 340,000 or 380,000 depending on whose figures are used. With some 340,000 survivors out of

a population of 500,000 or 540,000 a conclusion that German Jewry was "almost totally exterminated" is hardly an example of intellectual honesty. By which it is seen that the nonsensical style that allows one to sow confusion also allows one to develop a sensational effect. As the figure for the total, immigration for December 31, 1957, he gives the figure of 896,462, according to his data, on page 65, and the figure of 896,085, according to the data of others, on page 66. Finally, when he gives it straight from the statistics themselves, it becomes 905,655. The same is true for the total population of the State of Israel which on December 31, 1957, is 1,954,954 at page 64, and which becomes 1,763,600 Jews and 213,000 Christians and Moslems, yielding a total of 1,976,000 at page 74. If it were a question of orders of magnitude one would understand it and overlook it, but in every case these are estimates down to the unit. So it is a test. Mme. Hannah Arendt and Mr. Raul Hilberg, I confess, have not done much better.

There is no end to the examples that could be cited. In short, what I want to say here is that if these coefficients of exaggeration are of the same order -- and why not, since there is no question of error here but of deliberate calculation? -- as far as the percentages are concerned of those European, African, or Asian Jews, who, according to him have immigrated into Israel, it is enough to apply the median coefficient of exaggeration to reestablish them approximately in their actual relationships. The average coefficient is figured as follows: $(1.55+2.16)/2 = 1.85$. For the Jews of Africa and Asia: $(24.8\% + 28.8\%)/1.85 = 29\%$. And, for the European Jews: $43.4\% + (53.6\% - 29\%) = 68\%$. Still missing is the "three per cent" which I discussed above in my first conclusion concerning Mr. Andre Chouraqui's data.

Converted into figures, the number of immigrants of European origin then becomes, based on the total immigration (mortality and emigration included), $(1,541,718 \times 68)/100 = 1,048,368$ and, based on the number who survived and remained, $(1,444,128 \times 68)/100 = 982,007$. So, there it is in mathematical terms, at least the way I learned mathematics. Furthermore, it is reasonable, and for this reason: these figures correspond almost perfectly with those published by the *New York Times* on February 22, 1948, based on data supplied by its expert, Hanson W. Baldwin. And, to avoid any misunderstanding I cite from the text itself:

There are 650,000 to 700,000 Jews in Palestine. Another 500,000 inhabit other countries in the Middle East In these countries the Jews are tied by bonds of religion to the rest of the fifteen to eighteen million Jews of the world.

Among these 1,150,000 to 1,200,000 Jews in Palestine and the other countries of the Middle East in 1947, a deduction drawn from the number a Jewish source said were living there in 1931, there were a few more or a few less than 750,000 immigrants, depending upon whether one bases one's opinion on prewar or postwar Jewish statistics. And, almost all of these immigrants came from Europe for the good and simple reason, almost without exception, that there was no reason for those from other areas to move there *en masse*. The former had been the first to rejoin Israel, since they were more or less already there. Then they were joined later by 200,000 to 250,000 more European Jews, and to determine the immigration from that origin we get into figures of the kind that result from my calculations.

If I involve Mr. Hanson W. Baldwin in support of my thesis, it is not only because his estimates are credible but for a more solid reason: insofar as the figures for the Palestinian Jewish population are concerned, they have been confirmed by the official Israeli statistics published at the beginning of 1949, for the year 1947, which gave the number as 629,000. They were also given for Palestine by Mr. Ben Gurion himself, who in May 1948 estimated the Jewish population to be 650,000 (*Le Peuple et L'Etat d'Israel*, Paris 1959, p. 102). Therefore, there is nothing conjectural about them: on this point at least it is a verified estimate. And, it verifies mine.

I shall go further: if Mr. Hanson W. Baldwin was so well informed about the Jewish population in Palestine in 1947, there is no reason to think he was less informed on the world Jewish population, and therefore close to the truth in estimating it between 15 and 18 million on the same date. The *New York Times* said that the data came from the Jews themselves (in its own words: "from the secret census made by them in every country in the world"), and that explains everything: in one way or another Mr. Hanson W. Baldwin was informed about this "secret census." But it makes no difference. If this "secret census" really took place, and if the leaders of the Zionist movement know so exactly the actual number of Jewish losses, then we have a case of extortion (the payment of indemnity to Israel by West Germany) built up with premeditation -- and much better done than the robbery of the Glasgow-London train by gangsters that everyone is talking about at the moment. I used the words "so exactly," and I wish to call attention to the nuance, because I do not believe in that "secret census."

But, to return to the European Jews who immigrated to Israel between 1931 and 1962, their number is estimated to be 1,048,368, mortality and re-emigration included. Jewish sources admit to 388,901 for the December 31, 1957 date, and in 1963 this figure is still publicized by the world press. And, we already have 659,467 European Jews who were not exterminated by the Nazis, but who all the same figure in the list of exterminated in statistics of Jewish sources. Or, if you prefer, subtract 1,048,368 from the 9,243,000 given by Mr. Arthur Ruppin as living in the European areas which were controlled by the Nazis, in numbers and for various lengths of time between 1933 and 1945, or from the 9,600,000 given at Nuremberg by Justice Jackson. Take your choice.

My estimates are given down to units, too, but that is because if one is making mathematical calculations one cannot escape that servitude, mathematicians not having yet invented any other way of making calculations. I trust that the reader understands that it was a question of rounding off orders of magnitude. All of the elements that have entered into these calculations have been kept at the lowest possible figure so that I may not be accused of error greater than that which fits the contentions of the *World Center of Contemporary Jewish Documentation* and all the rest. It is my opinion that in orders of magnitude, these estimates show that 1,100,000 European Jews are to be subtracted from the figure that is given for the European Jewish population prior to the accession to power in Germany of Hitler, and that 700,000 be subtracted from the announced six million, depending on the method preferred. If new data are brought forth to make a revision necessary, there is no doubt in my mind that a raising, and not a lowering of the number to be subtracted will result. And, precisely because, in keeping the figure down to the lowest level within my system, more than once I have found that the level was too low.

-----Jewish Immigration 1931-1962-----Jewish Population 1931-1962

Origin	European	Non-Europ.	Total	In 1931	?at.Increase	In 1962
Over-all	1,048,368	493,350	1,541,718	-----	-----	-----
Settled	982,007	462,121	1,444,128+	174,610+	431,262(b)=	2,050,000
Mortality	13,943	6,561	20,504	-----	-----	-----
Emigration	52,418	24,668	77,086	-----	-----	-----
Verification	1,048,368@	493,350	1,541,718			(a)

(a) Levi Eshkol's population estimate (cf supra): 2,050,000

(b) I warn the reader who is unfamiliar with demographic studies that if he is tempted to think that the natural increase should correspond to the number of Jews actually living in Israel, less than 31 years of age, he will be committing a grave error; those, for example, who left Germany in 1938 in the arms of their parents are today only 24, and figure among the 1,444,128 immigrants. The same for all European children born in North Africa or elsewhere. Among them there are those who arrived in their parents' arms in 1957 or 1958, only 4 or 5 years old in 1962 and still could be included in the natural increase column. They are immigrants just as much as their parents.

Now let us proceed to a study of the Jewish population of the United States. The study of the Jewish Israeli population has so far led us only to the European Jews who succeeded in reaching Palestine, later the State of Israel, and who got there either from the west or by the Danube route via Constanza or Constantinople or both. There is another aspect of the migration of the European Jews between 1933 and 1945, the movement toward the East.

This other aspect is disclosed to us in at least two Jewish sources: Dr. Rudolf Kasztner(*Bericht des Komitees zur Rettung der ungarischen Juden*) and Alex Weisberg in collaboration with Joel Brand (*L'Histoire de Joel Brand, un échange de 10,000 camions contre un million de Juifs*). (And, incidentally, it is confirmed by both Mr. Raul Hilberg and Mme. Hannah Arendt, also.) This is what the former says:

Up to March 19, 1944, our chief work concerned the rescue and care of Polish, Slovakian, Yugoslavian refugees. With the German occupation of Hungary our efforts were extended to the defense of the Hungarian Jews... The occupation brought the death sentence to Hungarian Jews, numbering almost 800,000 souls, (*op. cit.*, p. 1, *Einleitung*)

Hungary, where the Jews were not persecuted by Admiral Horthy's government (a Jew, the banker Stern, was in fact a member of the Council and numerous others were deputies), was actually an asylum for Polish, Czechoslovakian and Yugoslavian Jews. This text sets the facts down and shows their significance: 800,000 minus 320,000 (Arthur Ruppin *dixit*) equal 480,000 Polish, Czechoslovakian and Yugoslavian Jews in Hungary on March 19, 1944.

Dr. Kasztner also tells us how the *Committee for the Salvation of the Jews of Budapest* went about their work, but the Alex Weisberg-Joel Brand team is more precise: it was through emigration via Constanza after supplying them with genuine or false passports. Once at Constanza they were saved because Rumania did not

persecute the Jews, except during a very brief period, between 1939 and 1945. To cut the discussion short, let us cite from the two associated authors:

In their haste to get rid of the Jews the Germans cared very little whether they disappeared over the border or into the crematory ovens... Foreign passports were the surest protection... Within a few weeks (after March 19, 1944) there were more nationals of the Republic of San Salvador (in Hungary) than of all the other countries combined ... After a protect from the Pope and President Roosevelt, the Swedish and Swiss governments issued thousands of passports, and we added thirty to forty thousand. Possessors of this viaticum were immunized against deportation. (*op. cit.*, pp. 55-56.)

To get "thirty to forty" thousand Swedish and Swiss passports circulated with impunity in a country as well watched over by the German and Hungarian police as Hungary was, Sweden and Switzerland would have had to issue, if not many more, at least that number. And since there were in circulation "more from the Republic of San Salvador than all the other countries combined" there must have been about 200,000 "immunized" against deportation.

But for all that, these "immunized" persons did not have absolute peace of mind about their fate just because of their passports, whether genuine or forged. Most of them got the passports only in order to leave Hungary more easily. There were some who left without a passport. And, that emigration occurred almost with Eichmann's complicity, since, as our authors tell us, Eichmann, "who had before the war worked on the mass deportation of Jews... interrupted when Germany went to war with Russia... had taken the idea up again, as soon as he arrived in Budapest." (*op. cit.*, p. 93.) Further on, they tell us in substance that with or without passports many Jews made it to Constanza, and from there they tried to find ships to take them to Haifa, a thing that was not always easy to do. If they failed in this, they tried at least to get to Constantinople. Nor was it always easy to disembark at Haifa. Those who succeeded could not all remain in Palestine because of the limitation imposed on immigration by England, and, in order to avoid arrest, many were obliged to scatter into the other countries of the Middle East, from whence they tried to get to Hong Kong, and from there to the United States or some other country on the American continent (Argentina, Brazil, Canada, etc.). Similarly, it was difficult for them to disembark at Constantinople.

But, it is Mr. Raul Hilberg, with the information that he unwittingly supplied so well and that he interpreted so poorly -- precisely because he is not aware of it, who makes it possible for us to reconstruct in its breadth and in its entirety the movement of the European Jews toward the American continent via Hong Kong. Really, it would be more accurate to say that his information only confirms the authenticity of the data, because we already have the facts and already had used and published most of them. I speak here of the Polish and Russian Jews who between 1939 and 1945, during the war operations, never found themselves on the German side of the battle line. There was a considerable number of them, and the study of the horrors of the Second World War to which I have devoted myself for a good fifteen years has convinced me that many of them found their way to the American continents, where they are best represented in the United States. The few detours that we shall be led to make in Europe during the course of this study will enable us to settle on the number who were able to get there via the West.

As far as the United States is concerned, our peripheral point of departure, here the obvious lie leaps to the eye right away: it is not true, as the *Institute of Jewish Affairs* of London claims, that 5.5 million Jews were living there in 1962. In 1926, Mr. Arthur Ruppin gave us a figure of 4,500,000 Jews, and the official U.S. census figure for that year was 4,081,242 (a total which census officials seem to have regarded as being "incomplete"). Curiously, for once almost all of the historians -- and the Jewish statisticians as well -- are in agreement that the best estimates lie close to the Ruppin figure. Nevertheless, we shall give the *Institute of Jewish Affairs* the benefit of the doubt and shall use the official 1926 census figure, keeping in mind that it is probably too low and that a figure which is closer to that of Mr. Arthur Ruppin is doubtless closer to the truth. Applying the coefficient of natural growth, one per cent annually, to the 1926 census figure, we get an American Jewish population of 5,550,489 persons in 1962 -- i.e., 36 years later. And if we had used the coefficient of Mr. Salo Baron of twenty per cent every sixteen years, we would have gotten 4,897,490 in 1942; 5,876,988 in 1958; and 6,170,837 in 1962. I Could not have asked for a better opportunity than this one to be able to accuse the *Institute of Jewish Affairs* of London of underestimating the American Jewish population by 670,837 persons instead of by only some 50,489. But, that is not my way of doing things, and I am content to show to what extent the two Jewish authorities are in disagreement between themselves. So, the American Jewish population in 1963 is 5,550,489 persons -- without taking into account the Jewish immigration since 1926, an important consideration.(15) And, also without taking into account the Jewish emigration, but that factor is negligible. In fact, Mr. Andre Chouraqui tells us (*op. cit.*, p. 67) that only 7,232 immigrants came to Israel from the Americas and Oceania between 1933 and 1957. And, it is not easy to imagine what reasons would urge them to go elsewhere.

In any case we are concerned with an examination of the Jewish immigration to the United States. We have already seen how since 1848, but particularly since 1880, immigration to the United States was part of the general movement of European peoples, known, in part, as the "Gold Rush." Between the two wars, in France, which was the best place to observe it since France was an almost obligatory passageway toward the West, the stream was fairly slow until the 1930s. From 1932 on, when Colonel Beck took over the post of Minister of Foreign Affairs in Poland, we began to see Polish Jews arriving in great numbers. And, after 1933, we began seeing the German Jews. The first Polish Jews who arrived in France went into business using methods so at variance with local custom and so unorthodox that they often aroused indignant protests. Then, one fine day they vanished, but it was soon seen that the heads of their businesses had been replaced by other Polish Jews. The German Jews, on the other hand, usually went straight through. At the end of 1937 the Austrian Jews appeared, and this stream was reinforced in 1938 after the *Anschluss*. And, at the end of 1938 and the beginning of 1939, came the Czechoslovakian Jews. From the end of World War I until 1932, we were aware mainly of the passage or settlement of Russian, Rumanian or Bulgarian Jews, among whom only a few Polish Jews had mixed, all chased from their respective countries by the Bolshevik storm and the instability that followed it. They came in small numbers, I repeat. For the over-all picture, from Jewish as well as government sources, shows that it was not a matter of moving whole populations of them. The Jewish population increased only from 250,000 to 300,000 from 1926 to 1939 (16) (to 270,000, according to Mr. Raul Hilberg) or exactly the natural increase rate, barely more.

How many then went through France, and where did they go? It is easy enough to give the number of German Jews. In 1939 there remained in Germany not more than 210,000, according to the World Center for Contemporary Jewish Documentation, and 240,000 according to Mr. Raul Hilberg. Official German statistics, in particular those of Mr. Richard Korherr, head of Hitler's population bureau, give a figure within the same range: 220,000. So if it were said that about 300,000 Jews had left Germany before 1939 everyone would agree. But, Mr. Andre Chouraqui (*op. cit.*, p. 66) says, that "120,000 immigrated to Israel between 1933 and 1939," which seems to indicate that at least 180,000 went somewhere else. Here, may I be permitted to bring forth my personal testimony? At Belfort, a city near the Franco-German frontier, and right on the itinerary of the largest number of Jewish refugees, because it is also near the Franco-Swiss border, I was, between 1933 and 1939, the leader of the Socialist Party. Because of that capacity, those German Jews who were Social Democrats and who had managed to cross the frontier, generally knew my address, and, in order to continue on their way, they preferred to turn to me for help rather than to the Jewish community. Most of them told me that their aim was to get to the United States where they had relatives who would make it easy for them to enter the country and to remain there in spite of the quota laws on immigration, which they knew were, under the circumstances, rarely enforced against them. A few of them spoke of Canada for the same reasons. Very few mentioned Brazil or Argentina; in these two countries it was only after the war that Jewish immigration assumed considerable proportions. During the occupation, still at Belfort, but where I then had the greatest responsibility in the most important and judicious Resistance movement (*Liberation-Nord*), which was the only effective channel for them, the same situation existed except that they first had to go over the border into Switzerland, where, with the help of the *Joint Distribution*, whose representative was Sally Mayer, they hoped to get a regular passport for the American continent, preferably for the United States or Canada. Not one of them ever, either before or during the war, mentioned England, for which they nourished a staunch hatred.

In 1937-1938, the same phenomenon occurred with the Austria Jews, and in 1938-1939 with the Czechoslovak Jews. We saw no more of the Jews from these countries in France during the war; they went by way of the Danube, the first after the *Anschluss*, the latter after the settling of the Sudeten affair.

For Austria, the statistics of the *World Center of Contemporary Jewish Documentation* and of Mr. Raul Hilberg agree with German sources: before 1939, 180,000 out of 240,000 had succeeded in leaving Austria. And, Mr. Andre Chouraqui finds that the number of Austrian Jews who immigrated into Israel is so insignificant that he doesn't see any need to mention it. Where, then did they go? I can only keep repeating: all those who turned to me, before, as well as during the war, gave the United States as their preference, or, in any case, a country on the American continent.

So, we have a total of 480,000 German and Austrian Jews who managed to leave Europe between 1933 and 1939. In this case, both the *World Center for Contemporary Jewish Documentation* and Mr. Raul Hilberg had the honesty not to include the latter among the number of Jews who they claimed were exterminated. We shall see, in the recapitulation table of the actual number of European emigrants, if they have been included in the number of those who augmented the Jewish

population of countries other than Israel, where they must have gone, since they are no longer in France.

On the number of Polish Jews, or those from the Danubian countries, who reached the American continent or Africa via the West, I had no accurate information which would permit me to establish it as other than "appreciable." Happily, my excellent collaborator, Mme. Hannah Arendt, came forth most usefully to complete my documentation. Mr. Raul Hilberg, too, from whom she had taken nearly everything she had said, proved to be quite useful. If I prefer to cite from Madame Hannah Arendt, it is because she expresses herself much more clearly than Mr. Hilberg; she borrows nearly everything from him, but her talent for clarity must be recognized. It is with regard to the French, Luxemburg, Belgian and Dutch Jews that she has so usefully completed my documentation of the Jews of Poland and the Danubian countries who left Europe via the West.

In France, she writes in the *New Yorker*, March 9, 1963, there were about 300,000 Jews in 1939 (that I knew), and, in February-March 1940, before the events which brought about the occupation of the country, 170,000 foreign Jews had joined them, that figure is what I was not sure about. At the time, all the French papers, as I remember, spoke of some 200,000 foreign Jews who had fled their countries in the face of Nazism, and that it was our duty to help them. But, I had kept no clippings. I was much more occupied in aiding the Jews than in counting them. Among them, were 40,000 Belgians and as many Dutch. What about the others? I have no precise facts. In any case, the total number probably was 170,000; one can be sure that Mme. Hannah Arendt, however, did not overestimate it. Since the government of Marshal Pétain refused to turn over the French Jews to the German authorities, and since he made so much trouble for them about the foreign Jews, she goes on, that of this mass of 470,000 Jews, only 52,000, among them 6,000 of French nationality, had been deported at the end of the summer of 1943, that is, in 18 months (massive deportation operations did not begin until March 1942). In April 1944, two months before the Allied landing, there were still 250,000 Jews in France, she says, and no further measures were taken against them. Therefore, they were saved. This fact does not keep Mr. Raul Hilberg from putting only 200,000 in the survivor column in his statistics. And, one must not think that the difference -- 470,000 minus 250,000 equals 220,000 -- were deported. On this difference, outside of her indication that there were "52,000, among them 6,000 of French nationality," at the end of the summer of 1943, Mme. Hannah Arendt gives us no information at all. But, the *World Center of Contemporary Jewish Documentation* tells us that 120,000 Jews in all were deported from France, without specifying the number of those of French nationality, which does not prevent it, when it comes to tallying the survivors, from stating peremptorily that there were only some 180,000, as we shall see on the chart for France, Belgium, Holland and Luxemburg. The *World Center* simply did not figure in this difference except among the number of those living in France in 1939, without taking the immigration factor into account.

And, here is Mme. Arendt's conclusion for Belgium: the 40,000 Belgium Jews who fled to France before the German invasion, together with 25,000 who were foreign to that country, were, she says, nearly all deported and exterminated. With the 50,000 which the *World Center of Contemporary Jewish Documentation* said were living there in 1945, we get a figure of 115,000. But, official Jewish statistics give only

90,000 Jews in Belgium in 1939. And, there is another important detail: no Belgian Jew was deported, because -- as Mme. Arendt explains -- in Belgium there was no Jewish Council (*Judenrat*) to register them and to designate them for deportation. But the foreign Jews, on the other hand, were all deported: they were nearly all Poles or Russians, and their very appearance called them to the attention of the German authorities, as she says.

And, for Holland: the 40,000 Jews who fled to France, plus the 118,000 who were deported (and exterminated naturally), plus the 60,000 that the *World Center of Contemporary Jewish Documentation* found still living in 1945 yield 218,000. But, according to official Jewish sources, there were only 150,000 Jews living in Holland in 1939.

Finally, for Luxemburg: 3,000 Jews lived there in 1939, minus the 2,000 who were deported gives 1,000 survivors in 1945.

Therefore, if we draw up a recapitulation table for these four countries in 1945, this is what it looks like :

-----Deportation of Western European Jews-----Survivors in 1945

	1939	1940(a)	Deported	Actual	Difference	Official	Off. counted as exterminated
France	300,000	470,000	120,000(b)	350,000	50,000	180,000	120,000
Belgium	90,000	115,000	25,000	90,000		50,000	40,000
Holland	150,000	218,000	118,000	100,000	(50,000)	60,000	90,000
Luxemb.	3,000	3,000	2,000	1,000	(2,000)	1,000	2,000
TOTALS	543,000	806,000	265,000	541,000	(2000)	291,000	252,000

(a) Actually for the year 1940 there should be two columns in this table; one with the data for before the invasion of Holland and Belgium (spring), which is the one, and one with the data for after the invasion, which would take into account the 40,000 Belgian Jews and the 40,000 Dutch Jews who fled to France. It would look like this : 75,000 in Belgium, 178,000 in Holland, and 550,000 in France in July 1940. The general total for the four countries would not have changed, nor the other data, nor the circumstances, so it was not thought useful to tangle up the calculations with figures that ended with the same results.

(b) I repeat that Exhibit No 100 of the Jerusalem Court claimed only 52,000 deportees from France, as of July 21, 1943.

Thus, of the Jews who are claimed to have been arrested in France, in Belgium, in Holland and in Luxemburg during the war, some 265,000 among them are said to have been exterminated in the concentration camps to which they were deported. But, when the war was over there were still in the four aforementioned countries, taken as a whole, 541,000 Jews or 2,000 less than there were living in them in 1939. This conclusion comes from the very figures that Mr. Raul Hilberg, his protégé, Mme. Hannah Arendt, and the *World Center of Contemporary Jewish Documentation* have given us. But, without knowing how, or why, the latter, when it comes to drawing official conclusions from these figures, concludes that there were only 291,000

survivors, and, for the number of exterminated, it finds a figure in the same range: 252,000.

Doubtless to distinguish himself and to demonstrate originality, again without knowing how or why, Mr. Raul Hilberg comes up with 261,000 survivors, and 242,000 exterminated, drawn from the same figures. And, naturally, Mme. Hannah Arendt follows in his footsteps. In *Eichmann's Confederates and the Third Reich Hierarchy*, the *Institute of Jewish Affairs* of the World Jewish Congress finds 261,000 survivors and 292,000 exterminated (p. 59). So, with only shades of difference, the Jewish sources seem to be in agreement.

The mechanism of this operation, which is so crude that it stares you in the face and which is found in all of the figuring of all of these people, is quite simple: in 1945, during the postwar turmoil, the Jewish communities of every country were supposedly invited to state very quickly what their losses had been so that Justice Jackson could take them into account in his speech for the prosecution at the Nuremberg Trial where such figures were prefaced with the expression: "it is estimated in full cognizance..."(17) As unscrupulous as we know Justice Jackson to have been, it is certain that, although he does not say what, he must have based his opinion on something. And, that something could only have been information of this sort. This information was assessed, not in the terms of all Jews who were survivors in a given country, but in terms of those who were nationals of that country and who were, then, subtracted from the number of their members who had lived there in 1939. The difference between these two figures was claimed to be the number of Jews who met their deaths in Nazi gas chambers. It was up to the Jewish communities in each country to account for Jews of other nationalities among them. But this was not done. In each of the European countries the same practice was followed, and, in the present instance, it developed that some 250,000 Jews were not counted as survivors anywhere, and that this missing 250,000 always turned up in the column of those exterminated in the statistics. It is by this process, multiplied by the number of countries, that the figure of six million exterminated European Jews was arrived at.

Considering only these four countries, the "non-nationals" were not the only ones involved. There were also those who possessed the nationality, but who had not yet returned -- many never returned -- and, therefore, were not present at the time when that fabricated inventory was drawn up. Since they were absent, they were included among the exterminated. However, most of them had emigrated. Although that emigration could not be proven in 1945, it can be today. We know, for example -- even if only through the Arendt-Hilberg team -- that at the moment of the arrival of the German troops in Belgium, no more than 5,000 Jews remained who had Belgian nationality, and that since no Jewish Council denounced them to the Germans, not one of them was arrested (Hannah Arendt, *op. cit.*). From this fact, the following can be concluded:

- a. Since there were 60,000 Jews in the country in 1926 (Arthur Ruppin *dixit*), and therefore not many less than 70,000 in 1939, including the natural rate of increase, it was not 40,000 who fled to France as Mme. Arendt says, but between 60,000 and 65,000.

b. When the World Center of Contemporary Jewish Documentation puts 40,000 Belgian Jews in the exterminated column, this is a wretched fraud.

And, the same conclusion holds for France where we know that at the end of the summer of 1943 only 6,000 Jews of French nationality had been deported. Here again, the Arendt-Hilberg tandem is in agreement. For the period from the end of summer 1943, to the end of the war, no exact information has been made public, as far as I know. But, Mr. Leon Poliakov (*Le Troisième Reich et les Juifs*), Mr. Michel Borwicz ("Les solutions finales à la lumière d'Auschwitz-Birkenau" in the *Revue d'Histoire de la seconde guerre mondiale*, October 1956), and Mr. Joseph Billig (*Le Dossier Eichmann*), all say that it was during the course of 1942 that the greatest number of French Jews was arrested and deported, in order to arrive at the admirably Jesuitical formula that "in all about 120,000 Jews were deported from France." But, if the greatest number of French Jews to be deported was 6,000, there is very little chance, mathematically speaking, that the number could have exceeded 11,999. Since the largest number was 6,000, arithmetically, the smallest number could not be larger than 5,999. The question remains: what became of the other 110,000 (or, at the least, the other 108,000) who are among the 120,000 French exterminated, when it has been established that they were not even arrested and deported? If I answer that question by saying that they had left France, I do not think that I can be accused of conjecturing. Because if they were not deported, if they were not exterminated, and if they were no longer there, then they must have gone somewhere else.

It was from Holland that the greatest number of national Jews was deported. How many? The contradictory data in the recapitulation table permit two equally contradictory replies, one of which is necessarily without value:

On the one hand, if 40,000 Dutch Jews fled to France, where they were not deported and where they were found again in 1945, and if in 1945, 60,000 were found still surviving in Holland, then, by referring to the statistics for 1939, we subtract 40,000 plus 60,000 from 150,000 and get 50,000 national Jews actually deported who did not return -- at least they had not returned by 1945;

On the other hand, if out of the 543,000 from the statistics for the countries of France, Belgium, Holland and Luxemburg considered as a block, who were living there in 1939, only 291,000, who had one or the other of the four nationalities, were found again in 1945, then 252,000 (figured by subtracting 291,000 from 543,000) of the former did not have one or the other nationalities, were strangers there, and had replaced, number for number, 252,000 French, Belgian, Dutch or Luxemburg Jews who were not arrested there, were not deported, and yet were no longer there. Among them, it is known from an assured source, that there were a minimum of 108,000 French and 60,000 Belgians. There were 1,000 Luxemburgers who also were officially there. Therefore, by subtracting 169,000 from 252,000 we have a maximum of 83,000 Dutch Jews. In the column of deportees, who had not returned in 1945 there were 67,000, which is determined by taking 83,000 from 150,000. And, that is the only true fact that can be given as being verified by Jewish sources themselves, with regard to the details that they give. What it might be in reality, is another story. And whether these 67,000 Dutch deportees were exterminated is also another story. In any case, it is far from being established as fact, since to do that it would require that no one came back after being deported, and such a contention is untenable. This

conclusion holds true not only for Holland but for France and Luxemburg, too. There is no problem with regard to Belgium, since not one Belgian Jew was deported, or at least very nearly so.

Considering France, Belgium, Holland and Luxemburg, en bloc, the obvious conclusion is the following: a maximum of 12,000 French Jews, 67,000 Dutch Jews, and 2,000 Luxemburg Jews yields a total of 81,000 Jews who were deported according to the data provided from Jewish sources, and not 252,000 as they claim. (As has been pointed out in the preceding paragraphs, no Jews were deported from Belgium.) Even if not one came back, which is improbable, it would still result in an exaggeration of 171,000 Jews, to be subtracted from the column of exterminated. And, that figure is just for these four countries.

But there are other conclusions to be drawn: With regard to the 252,000 Jews of these four countries who were not exterminated since they had not been deported, and yet were not in one or the other country in 1945, one or two things can be said: either they returned after 1945, in which case they must be included again in the European Jewish population, or else they did not return and they must be included in the population of the country to which they went and in which they remained. It is the second case that must be looked into since no Jewish source lists them as having returned to Europe. The question remains: where are they then? Are they in the United States, in Canada, in Argentina, in South Africa? These questions cannot be answered until we determine the total number of Jews who succeeded in leaving Europe. One way of making this determination is by conducting an investigation into the Jewish population in all the countries where they increased the population, and there is only one for which there is no Jewish source: the United States. In any case, not having officially returned to Europe, these 252,000 -- who could not have left Europe until after 1940 -- must be added to the 300,000 German Jews and the 180,000 Austrian Jews who had left before 1940. In other words, we have a total of 732,000 European Jewish emigrants.

With regard to the 252,000 Jews who did not have the nationality of any of the four countries in question, who replaced number for number the 252,000 Jews who are discussed in the preceding paragraph, and who were found still living in 1945, the following is clear: in the statistics of the countries from which the latter came they are listed in the exterminated column, and, in order to take mathematical count of the living and the dead of those countries, which is the first task to be done, they must be reintegrated among the living. But "to reintegrate them among the living" in the statistics does not mean that they returned to those countries. Officially not one returned, since not one was officially reintegrated into the statistics, nor in actuality either, since, with the exception of western Germany, these countries are on the other side of the Iron Curtain. For the same reason, the same is true for France, Belgium, Holland and Luxemburg. The second task to be done will be to reintegrate them into the population statistics of the countries to which they went after their number has been determined. In any case, it is already possible to say that here we have again 252,000 more European Jews who have emigrated, and that figure, when added to the 732,000 figure that is mentioned above, makes a total of 984,000.

Finally, with regard to the 265,000 Jews who were arrested in France, Belgium, Holland and Luxemburg, we find that among them, as we have seen, 81,000 were

nationals of one or the other of these countries. So it follows that 184,000 were without the nationality of any of these countries. The same logic as above applies here, with the exception that those 184,000 Jews should be reintegrated into the exterminated (it would be more exact to say, people missing in 1945) columns of the countries from which they come.

To correctly reintegrate those 252 000 survivors, who are listed as dead, and those 184,000 who are listed as exterminated, for a total of 436,000 Jews, into the statistics of the countries from which they came, we must know which countries. But, can we determine these exactly? Mme. Hannah Arendt -- via Mr. Raul Hilberg -- says that they were "Poles, Russians, Germans, etc... However, it is not very clear who that "etc." covers. It is not likely that it covers the Yugoslavs who left Europe by way of Italy, Greece, or Hungary; the Austrians who took the Danube route or went via Switzerland after the *Anschluss*; or the Czechoslovakians who took the Danube way through Hungary, as Dr. Kasztner specifies. Moreover, the Russians could only leave via Constantinople and the shores of the Caspian or the Birobidjan after the war began. Following the outbreak of hostilities, only the Germans continued to emigrate secretly through Holland and Belgium or Luxemburg for the reason that the Rhine had to be crossed, and it was easier for them to cross it on German territory than where it forms the frontier. Therefore, there were Germans in appreciable numbers, doubtless, but surely not in significant numbers because they were only those who had remained in Germany after 1939. The others, as Mr. Chouraqui has told us, had already left Europe, and 120,000 among them were in Israel. There remain the Poles for whom the truly mass emigration began in the spring of 1939, when the situation between England and Germany was disintegrating, and for whom Belgium, Holland, and France were their escape routes, too. Until the end of August 1939, they could even cross Germany with Polish passports. They constituted almost the whole of those 436,000 Jews who were neither French, Belgian, Dutch, nor Luxemburger, and who were to be found in one or the other of those countries in May 1940 when their emigration route was cut by the German armies during the "Battle of France."

I have no precise information available that would allow me to divide up these 436,000 Jews among the nationalities cited, as should be done, because they can no longer be counted, and to deduct them separately from the statistics of Jewish sources, given for each of them for 1939, or to reintegrate them into the 1945 statistics taking the dead and the living into consideration. Aside from that, any of them who were not Polish or German were the exception; that is, they were a negligible number. The Germans, themselves, were only a small contingent, amounting to 20,000, 30,000 or 40,000 perhaps, but no one knows for certain. It is about that, in any case.

After that time, two methods are possible: First, one can study the Jewish population in the aggregate, for all the above-named countries, by deducting as a whole from the start those 436,000 persons from the 1939 statistics, and, in accordance with the calculations, by adding for 1945 the 184,000 who were arrested to the corresponding column. Since we are looking at the European Jews, not Jews by nationality, mathematically and on that level, no error would have been made. But there are two things against it: the division of the Polish Jews between the Russian and the German zones after the German-Russian invasion, and their migration toward Hungary, which, by leaving out so significant a number as 350,000 to 400,000 Polish Jews, could only

lead to results whose aberrant character as far as Poland is concerned, would inevitably have had repercussions multiplied on a European scale.

Second, since those 436,000 Jews were in the great majority Polish, they can be considered -- mathematically -- as being all Polish, and they can be integrated into Polish statistics only. In terms of such a calculation, the results were off by no more than 20,000, 30,000 or 40,000 of them who were not Polish, but the error did not exceed, on the whole, one or two tens of thousands of persons on the nationality level. And, on the other hand, mathematically, it could be automatically and exactly corrected on the level of the Jewish population of Europe, by an error exactly corresponding, inversely, if I decided not to take into account those 20,000, 30,000 or 40,000 in the study of the German Jewish population. It is the second method that I adopted: the solution of a problem by the well-known process of false supposition. Having given this explanation, which is indispensable for an understanding of what follows, we take Poland first.

In Poland, Mr. Arthur Ruppin tells us, there were 3,100,000 Jews in 1926. In 1939 there were 3,300,000, as the *World Center for Contemporary Jewish Documentation* and the *Institute of Jewish Affairs* of New York tell us. Mr. Raul Hilberg goes even further, with a figure of 3,350,000. But it is nonsense to think that this could be right, since they were constantly, and in numbers, migrating since 1932. Let us say that there were 3,100,000 in the spring of 1939, when mass migration began. We have decided that arithmetically 436,000 were on their way through Holland, Belgium and France, when the invasion of those countries by German troops took place. So, there should have remained in Poland at the moment of invasion 2,664,000. In reality there were less, because the Polish Jews had also tried to leave by the Danube route: the *Kasztner Report*, as we have seen, tells us that a certain number of the latter were still in Hungary on March 19, 1944, mixed with Czechs and Hungarians. And since the Nazi invasion of Hungary took place on March 19, 1944, how many Polish Jews fell into German hands?

First, we must determine how many there were in the aggregate for the three nationalities? There had been, as Dr. Kasztner specifies, 800,000 Jews in Hungary, more or less permanently since the beginning of the war. In 1926, Mr. Arthur Ruppin had counted 320,000. With the natural rate of increase these 320,000 had become 361,600 in 1939, and not 404,000 as claimed by the *World Center of Contemporary Jewish Documentation*. Taken together, the Poles, Czechoslovakians and Yugoslavs, who were living in Hungary, added up to 438,400 persons. And by taking each of these three nationalities separately in detail, we get the following:

1. Czechoslovakians: the statistics drawn up by Mr. Richard Korherr (already cited) for the Wannsee Conference, which was to have taken place on December 9, 1940, but which did not take place until January 20, 1942 (Wannsee Protocol in *Eichmann und Komplizen*, Robert Kempner, *op. cit.*) -- that is, before deportation of the Jews was undertaken -- tell us that in Bohemia-Moravia there were still 74,200 of them, the rest having fled to Slovakia, when Czechoslovakia was dismembered (1938-39), and 88,000 in Slovakia. Mr. Arthur Ruppin's statistics for 1926 give 260,000. With the natural increase rate of 1%, which we have used throughout this study, that makes the Jewish population 293,800 in 1939 and not 315,000. And, that means that in Hungary, continuing along the route by which they were fleeing, there could have been 131,600

Czechoslovakian Jews, this figure being determined by subtracting 74,200 plus 88,000 from 293,800.

2. Yugoslavs: Mme Hannah Arendt takes from Mr. Raul Hilberg the fact that when Hermann Krumei arrived in Zagreb at the end of 1943 he found a certain number of Jews in the country and deported 30,000. On this point all Jewish sources are in agreement. The Wannsee Protocol mentions 40,000 at the end of 1941. The rest had fled to Italy and Hungary. In all there were 75,000 Jews in Yugoslavia in 1926, as Mr. Arthur Ruppin says, and this figure is accepted by the *World Center of Contemporary Jewish Documentation*. It could be that the Yugoslavian Jewish emigration matched the natural increase since that is a country where not only Jews, but all the ethnic groups, and in all periods, were numerically very fluctuating. The difference, or 35,000 could be equally divided between Italy and Hungary, or 17,500, a little more or less for each. The *World Center of Contemporary Jewish Documentation* found 20,000 Jews there in 1945, and that would indicate that out of Krumei's 40,000 deportees, 20,000 returned from the concentration camps where they had been sent, and the rest died in the camps.

3. Poles: Without counting those who, with or without genuine or forged passports which were given to them by the Committee for Jewish Safety of Budapest (Joel Brand *dixit*), had succeeded in leaving Poland for Hungary after 1939, there were approximately 289,300 Poles. This figure is determined by subtracting the 149,100 Czechoslovakian and Yugoslavian Jews from 438,400.

On the basis of the preceding discussion, we can conclude that there remained in Poland under German-Russian occupation 2,374,700 Jews, figured by subtracting 289,300 from 2,664,000 and not 3,100,000, 3,300,000 or 3,350,000. Moreover, that number was divided up between the German and the Russian zones.

Now, another question arises: in what proportion were these 2,374,700 Jews divided between the two zones? With the fine want of realization which seems to keep him from making the simplest of accurate calculations, Mr. Raul Hilberg, who found 3,350,000 Polish Jews in 1939, puts 2,100,000 in the German zone and 1,200,000 in the Russian zone. At least, that is the idea one gets. But, it is a worthless estimate; in terms of what has been said, which is as historically as demographically irrefutable, it does not bear examining.

Then, how many were there on each side? In order to answer this question as exactly as possible, two elements must be taken into account: the flight of the Jews before German troops pushing into Poland, and the steps taken against them from July 1940 on.

Like the Dutch and Belgian Jews, the Polish Jews fled before German troops, either toward Hungary, or into that part of Poland destined to be occupied by the Russians. The proportion of the latter cannot be determined, it seems, unless the number of those who did not go in that direction can be determined. A very large number, without doubt, fell into Russian hands, because there was actually for a certain time a German policy of turning over to the Russians Jews encountered in the German area. This is attested to by Zwi Patcher and Yacov Goldfine, two witnesses for the

Prosecution at the Nuremberg Trial, who later testified on May 1, 1961. The first stated:

All our money and our jewelry were taken from us. Then, in the columns of four, we were conducted toward the East. It was in December. It was cold, rainy and we were shivering. When one of us dropped with fatigue, he was taken aside and a pistol shot put him out of his sufferings. But it was forbidden to turn one's head, or one was shot, too. At the end of three days our group had been greatly decimated. We arrived at the frontier of the Soviet occupation zone in Poland. Our executioners had ordered us to put our hands on our heads and to shout "Vive Stalin." But just the same the Russian sentinels pushed us back into a German area, where we were left to ourselves. During the night, we crossed the frontier to reach a small Jewish village in the Russian zone, where our co-religionists gave us shelter. (*Le Figaro*, May 2, 1961.)

The second made an analogous statement. Helped, even though so brutally, by the Germans to get into the Russian zone, quite a number of Polish Jews must have made it.

The story of the steps taken against them is more specific. Mme. Mary Berg tells us (*Le Ghetto de Varsovie*, Paris, 1947), and Mr. Leon Poliakov, who seems to have taken his information from her, confirms it (*Le Bréviaire de la Haine*), that in Poland the Germans were not seriously concerned with the Jews until war operations in the West were over, that is, during July 1940. Until then, the Jews were under surveillance, suffered innumerable persecutions and vexations, but they were not confined to their houses; and, they took advantage of that fact to make a run for Hungary via Slovakia. After the construction of the ghetto in Warsaw was completed (October 16, 1940), escape was possible, but only at great risk. They were all under house-arrest, and the Jew hunt began that was to round them all up there. But, in July 1941, the Jewish population in Warsaw, counted in 1939, had increased from 359,827 to only half a million, all within the ghetto.

Therefore, in all of the German zone, the German police authorities had been able to find only 140,000 to 150,000. To escape the measures to concentrate them, the Jews began to flee toward every remote spot, in the mountains and the forests. When they were found they often were considered to be partisans; consequently there were struggles during which many of them perished. But, even if the Germans who were tracking them all over had succeeded in capturing a quarter or a fifth of them during that period (and, in view of the efficiency of their police at that time, this is a plausible estimation because in France it was about the same when they went after those subject to forced labor), that fact still does not put the Jewish Population of the German zone, the Warsaw ghetto included, at more than about 1,100,000. Thus, out of 2,374,700 who made up the total Jewish population of the two zones, 1,274,700, were in the Russian zone. And, even if Mr. Raul Hilberg did not know how to subtract, this figure is not very far from his. Let us congratulate him all the same. We regret at the same time that he did not find so approximate a result for the German zone. We know about the Jews who went behind the Russian lines; the Jewish journalist, David Bergelson, told us (*Die Einheit*, December 5, 1942, *op. cit.*) that thanks to evacuation measures 80 per cent of them were saved and were transported to Central Asia by the Soviet authorities. So, the following calculations show the fate of

the Polish Jews: $(1,274,700 \times 20)/100 = 254,940$ who fell into German hands and $(1,274,700 \times 80)/100 = 1,019,760$ who did not.

And in the German zone? It seems that only by comparisons of the difference can we find out. On the one hand, here are 1,019,760 survivors found in the Russian zone. On the other, in 1945 Mr. Salo Baron found 700,000 for both zones (according to his testimony at the Jerusalem Tribunal). The total of those not found in 1945 can be figured as follows: $2,374,700 - (1,019,760 + 700,000) = 654,940$. And to this 654,940 for the whole of Poland may be added the 182,000 arrested in Holland, Belgium, France and Luxemburg, or 836,940. All of the preceding data, it must be remembered, comes from Jewish sources. We shall not dispute whether or not they were all arrested; but that they were all exterminated we may, just the same, doubt.

So, now we can begin to determine the total number of survivors: first, we must reintegrate into the statistics, the 252,000 who in 1945 were found still alive in Holland, Belgium, Luxemburg, and France. We can do this by adding the 1,019,760 survivors from the Russian zone together with the 700,000 that had been found by Professor Salo Baron and these 252,000. We get a total of 1,971,760, based solely on the total number of Jews remaining in Poland after 1939. Second, we must add in those Jews who had tried to flee westward. Here we shall add 2,374,700 plus 252,000 plus 182,000 to get 2,812,700. The number of Jews who, having fled to Hungary (289,300) were either deported from there or found alive there in 1945, can only be included in the totals made for Hungary itself.

But, we have not finished with Poland yet. Mr. Raul Hilberg found 50,000 survivors there; the *Institute for Jewish Affairs* of New York found 400,000; the *World Center of Contemporary Jewish Documentation* found 500,000; and, from the calculations based on Mr. Salo Baron's data, put into its historical context, there were actually a minimum of 1,971,760 survivors out of a population of 2,812,700 Jews (excluding those who succeeded in leaving Europe via Hungary and whose number is unknown because, as we have seen, it has been possible to count in Hungary, only those who remained there). After 1945 it was possible for the *World Center of Contemporary Jewish Documentation* to make its calculations easily by asking all the Jewish communities for a report of their numbers by nationality, and it is the latter which should have figured in the statistics. It could also have included the Polish Jews deported and then found as survivors in Hungary, which would have saved us all this figuring, if it had honestly given the results of its investigations. Instead of that, for Poland, it gives 500,000 survivors only, or 1,472,760, who are listed as dead in the European statistics, but who are alive and who are not listed as such in any statistics of any country of the other continents. Of those, at the end of our study of the western countries, we had already found 984,000. Here we must add 984,000 to 1,472,760 for a total of 2,456,760 survivors.

The next stage is an examination of **Russia**. The situation here is not involved: everything is very clear. Mr. Raul Hilberg, who finds 3,020,000 Jews there in 1939, concludes that 420,000 were exterminated, and 1,600,000 survived. Mr. Arthur Ruppin gave 3,000,000 Jews in 1926. Between 1926 and 1939 Jewish emigration probably corresponded to their natural rate of increase because the Russian Jews have always been in an endemic state of migration. And, if we accept David Bergelson's evidence, we can calculate the number of sure survivors as follows: $(3,000,000 \times$

$80/100 = 2,400,000$, which leaves 600,000 missing in 1945. Mr. Raul Hilberg gives only 420,000 as exterminated, which can mean only one thing: if 600,000 Russian Jews fell into German hands, 180,000 were not exterminated -- perhaps they were not even arrested and deported, or, if they were, they came back from the camps where they were interned. The percentage of those exterminated in the latter case is seventy per cent (420,000 out of 600,000) and of survivors, thirty per cent. That is still a fearful number. The World Center of Contemporary Jewish Documentation finds that 1,500,000 were exterminated (in the German zone, none in the Russian zone) which means there were 1,500,000 survivors, but to make it sensational, it gives 600,000 for the German zone in such a way that the reader thinks it applies to both zones. On the same data, the *Institute of Jewish Affairs* of New York finds 1,000,000 exterminated and 2,000,000 survivors.

But, Mr. Raul Hilberg charges the *Institute of Jewish Affairs* with an exaggeration of 580,000, figured by subtracting 420,000 from 1,000,000 deportees who it lists as being exterminated in its statistics, and the *World Center of Contemporary Jewish Documentation* with having made an exaggeration of 1,080,000 (figured by subtracting 420,000 from 1,500,000) in its statistics. It is in the statistics of the latter that we have calculated this exaggeration. Thus, we come to this conclusion: the 1,080,000 Jews who were incorrectly listed in the exterminated column, and who were quite alive in 1945, if they are no longer in Russia, nor elsewhere in Europe, must be living -- with their offspring since 1945 -- in another country on another continent. Our study of the Polish Jewish population brought us to 2,456,760 survivors. To this number we can add 1,080,000 for a total of 3,536,760 survivors.

The case of the Jews of the **Baltic** countries is as clear as that of the Russian Jews. To my knowledge no one has ever taken into account the number of Finnish Jews exterminated. For the three other countries, Mr. Arthur Ruppin gave the following figures for 1926: Esthonia, 5,000; Latvia, 80,000; Lithuania, 160,000; total, 245,000. By moving 10,000 to 15,000 individuals around from one country to another, the *World Center of Contemporary Jewish Documentation* comes to the same total, and Mr. Raul Hilberg gets 244,500 for 1939. What about the natural increase from 1926 to 1939? He does not consider this. Perhaps he felt that emigration compensated for it. But we are within 500, so let us call it 245,000. According to David Bergelson, the survivors can be calculated as follows: $(245,000 \times 80)/100 = 196,000$. And, 196,000 subtracted from 245,000 yields 49,000 missing in 1945. The *World Center of Contemporary Jewish Documentation* finds 219,000 exterminated and 26,000 survivors. As for Mr. Raul Hilberg, he gives us a higher figure: 244,500 exterminated, and no survivors. It is hard to see why, if the Russians evacuated the Jews all along the front lines -- and, Mr. Raul Hilberg subscribes to that fact if not to its significance -- they should have deliberately made an exception in the Baltic countries. Mr. Raul Hilberg claims this, but does not give an explanation. Here once again, 196,000 minus 26,000 (from the official statistics) gives 170,000 Jewish survivors, carried over into the column of exterminated, who, since they are no longer in the Baltic countries, are somewhere else in the world together with their offspring born since 1941-42. The total of survivors at this stage: 3,536,760, plus 170,000 or 3,706,760.

Let us proceed by returning to the West: First, we shall examine **Czechoslovakia**. We have seen that 260,000 Jews counted in 1926 by Mr. Arthur Ruppin could, at the most, have become 293,800 by 1939 and not 315,000 as is claimed by other Jewish

sources. We have also seen that 131,600 among them had surely fled into Hungary through Slovakia, and that when the deportations began, 162,200 remained in the country, according to the German statistics of Mr. Korherr who had a tendency to exaggerate what he called the "Jewish danger" rather than to lessen it. (For example, for Europe he gave eleven million Jews in 1941!) The *World Center of Contemporary Jewish Documentation* found 55,000 survivors in 1949. Logically, then, 107,200 only could have been deported from Czechoslovakia. Even if one insists on taking "Exhibit 83" of the Eichmann Trial in Jerusalem seriously, which takes account of the deportation, very much disputed, of 15,000 Jews of the Protectorate of Lodz on October 15, 1941, that would still give a total of only 122,200 deportees. After October 15, 1941, the Jerusalem court made no further case for any other deportation from the Protectorate of Bohemia-Moravia except to give an overall total, without any justification whatever of 35,000. And even if one accepts it, the total is still only 142,000. Except for this, all the other Jews of the Protectorate are listed as having been victims of the forced emigration that was organized by Eichmann from Prague before the war. (See, "Exhibit 66" which gives no figures.) It is only for Slovakia that the Jerusalem Court gives an estimate of Jewish losses: for the whole, "more than 70,000 out of 90,000" ("Exhibit 104"); 58,000 up to the end of May 1942, and more than 12,000 from September 1944 to March 1945. If we refer to that Court for an estimate of Jewish losses for all Czechoslovakia, we find 70,000 in Slovakia plus 35,000 in Bohemia-Moravia which gives a total of 105,000. And, that means that, when it claims to have found only 55,000 Jews still alive there in 1945, the *World Center of Contemporary Jewish Documentation* attempted to promote a truth which the judges of the Jerusalem Tribunal did not admit, since it was on documentation officially supplied by the *Center* that they based their conviction. But, the significance of this disavowal is seen with regard to the number of Czechoslovakian Jews announced in the general statistics given by this group as having been exterminated since it fixed the number at 260,000, figured by subtracting 55,000 from 315,000. Actually, the balance should be as follows:

1. Czechoslovakian Jewish population in 1939: 293,800
 2. Those Jews who crossed into Hungary (where the discount of the deportees and those found again alive are included in the totals resulting from calculations made for Hungary, since it is impossible to do otherwise. (18)): 131,600
 3. Those Jews who remained in Czechoslovakia prior to the deportation program: $293,800 - 131,600 = 162,200$
 4. The number of deportees as determined by the Jerusalem Tribunal: 105,000
 5. Those Jews who were not deported from Czechoslovakia: $162,200 - 105,000 = 57,200$
 6. The number of those not deported, as determined by the *World Center of Contemporary Jewish Documentation*: 55,000
- $57,200 - 55,000 = 2,200$

And, here we have 2,200 European Jews listed among the dead who were quite alive in 1945, and who -- since they are no longer in Europe, officially -- must be on the lists of those living in another country on another continent. In the study of the Jewish population of the Baltic countries we found 3,706,760 for the whole, in the same situation. Now, we have 3,706,760 plus 2,200 or 3,708,960.

Next, we shall study **Hungary**. There, the Jewish situation was as complicated as in Poland. Mr. Arthur Ruppin had counted 320,000 Jews in 1926, and we have seen that they probably increased to 361,600 by 1939. The *World Center of Contemporary Jewish Documentation* gives 404,000 and Mr. Raul Hilberg 400,000 (19), Dr. Kasztner, as we have also seen, gives 800,000 Jews as continuously living there since the beginning of the war (20), including -- according to him -- 205,800 Czechoslovakians, 215,000 Poles, and 17,500 Yugoslavs and, apparently, 361,700 Hungarians. The question is, how many of those 800,000 Jews were arrested and deported? And, here we have a hopeless muddle. It is over the deportation and the fate of the Hungarian Jews that the divergences in the accounts of the proZionist witnesses and the interpretations given to them by those who, since the end of the war, have made it their business to dramatize the Jewish tragedy, are the most numerous, the most serious, and the most contradictory. Of these divergences the reader has already had a taste from the analysis made of the Höss testimony, commandant of the Auschwitz camp, and of Miklos Nyiszli, the pertinence of which my references to the *Kasztner Report* and the book of Joel Brand have confirmed on all points. These divergences make the contentions of the Zionist movement so vulnerable, on the whole, that it was on the deportation of the Hungarian Jews -- in the hope of promoting an official truth around which the whole world could be rallied -- that the Jerusalem Tribunal was most precise. It is quite obvious, for example, that the five trains a day containing 4,000 or 5,000 persons was a piece of stupidity which absolutely had to be eliminated, because during the 52 days while the deportation of the Hungarian Jews lasted, that number would yield 260 trains and between 1,040,000 and 1,300,000 deportees from a country in which, at the maximum, there were only 800,000 Jews, of whom, moreover, it has been clearly said that 200,000 were not deported. (21)

The Court of the Jerusalem Tribunal therefore decided that from May 16 to July 7, 1944, "in less than two months, 434,351 persons were deported in 147 freight trains, at about 3,000 persons per train, men, women, and children, or an average of 2 to 3 trains a day" ("Exhibit 112"); that "12,000 were killed at Kamenetz-Zodolsk during the summer of 1941;" that "45,000 to 50,000 died while working in Galicia and in the Ukraine in 1941-42" ("Exhibit 111"); that "1,500 in the camp at Kistarzca were deported on July 20, 1944, ("Exhibit 113"); that "50,000 left Budapest on foot for the Austrian frontier (220 km. away) after November 10th" ("Exhibit 115"); and, finally, that "15,000 [were] sent to Austria to the Vienna-Strasshof camp to be kept in the ice-house," ("Exhibit 116"), on a date given without further detail as "after June 30, 1944." That total accounted for varies between 557,851 and 562,851. "Exhibit 115," which mentions the 50,000 Jews who left Budapest on foot, does not say it, but the *Report* of Dr. Kasztner makes it clear that this march was interrupted on Himmler's orders about the 17th or 18th of November, that 7,500 persons were saved and brought back to Budapest, and that 38,000 only (22) reached Germany. If account is taken of the 200,000 survivors given in the statistics of the *World Center of Contemporary Jewish Documentation*, there must have been, in Hungary, 757,851 or

762,861 Jews in all on March 19, 1944. And, likewise, Mr. Raul Hilberg estimated the number to be about 750,000. But, see how our methods and approaches differ: I draw the conclusion that out of the "800,000 souls in the Hungarian Jewish community," ("Exhibit 111"), there were 40,000 to 50,000 that the Jerusalem Court could not account for. As for Mme Hannah Arendt, with her maximum of "476,000 Hungarian victims," (and we shall never know how she got the number) we are struck by the fidelity with which she reports what she sees and hears when she is sent out to write a story. And, we can understand why it is that Mr. Robert W. Kempner has publicly expressed his dissatisfaction with her work. (*Die Aufbau*, *op. cit.*).

Now we shall take up the whole business in detail:

1. The number of trains. We may be richly informed about the arrival of these trains at Auschwitz-Birkenau, but we have much less detail about their departure from Hungary. So I shall begin by saying that to gather together 3,000 persons in a station and load them into 40 cars is not a minor undertaking, and, to make it clear to those who are not specialists in transportation, I know of no better way than to cite from my own experience during the departure, from the camp at Compiègne, of the train in which I was deported to Buchenwald.

Camp Royallieu where we were first assembled could hold about 10,000 persons. Every week, at the end of 1943, about 1,500 arrived, and as many left. The transport in which I was included was composed of 1,500 able-bodied persons and about 50 sick.

Awakened at six in the morning, collected on the parade grounds, grouped in fives, and by fives in hundreds, we finally left the camp a little before eight o'clock with the 15 squads of 100 each in the lead and with a truck following slowly behind that carried those who were sick. A procession of 15 squads of 100 persons, marching five abreast, is long; armed soldiers were stationed at the head and in a single line along the sides; a space of 350 to 400 meters was maintained between each squad; and a special guard followed at the rear of the column.

A little before nine o'clock, we found ourselves lined up along the station platform with each group of 100 (23) facing a train car into which it must climb. The train: it was a long line -- it seemed immense to us -- of freight cars. How many? I did not count. Probably, there was a car for each group (making 15) plus a special car for the 50 sick persons. I noticed that on the roof of every third car were soldiers armed with a machine gun and something else which those of us in my squad decided was a floodlight. At the head and at the rear were two passenger cars in which additional guards traveled to reinforce, if necessary en route, the other guards who were stationed among the cars. In addition, there were freight cars which carried supplies. In all, 25 to 30 cars -- 25 at a minimum. And, a train of 25 to 30 cars is very long. Even so, such a train carried fewer than 1,600 prisoners with 100 per car.

A little after 10 o'clock the train seemed to be about ready to depart. No one was left on the platform, we were told by those who could see from the skylights at the head an end of the car. Nevertheless, the train did not move. A railway man explained: a train that is not in the timetables cannot just simply depart; all of the stations along the

way have to be notified, and that can only be done at the moment when it is about to start. Another long hour of waiting: a little before noon the train got under way.

In all, our departure took a good half day. And we heard plenty of "*Los!*" and "*Schnell!*" On our arrival at Buchenwald, we were unloaded a little faster; but each car was brought to the platform separately, since the unloading platform was not as long as the train. It took at least two good hours to empty all the cars, so they could go to Weimar.

I do not mean to say that what took place at Budapest was exactly the same as Compiègne, but only that, whether here or there, the job was the same in varying degrees. Everywhere, for example, people had to be collected together, the cars loaded, and so forth; all these things took about the same amount of time no matter where they happened.

From reading the *Kasztner Report* and Joel Brand's book, one gets the impression that there were 200,000 to 250,000 Jews in Budapest, although a more precise estimate, which neither gives, cannot be stated. The organizations of which they were the heads seem, indeed, to have tried to avoid too great a concentration of Jews in the capital and to have tried to spread out over the whole country the 400,000 odd Poles, Czechoslovaks and Yugoslavs who were continually arriving in a steady flow. Where they could not avoid this concentration was in the Hungarian and Rumanian frontier regions which they were all trying to reach, and that is why, except for Budapest, one or two centers for these areas (east of the Theiss) were chosen as assembly points for which trains could leave directly for Auschwitz without going through Budapest. At Budapest itself, the Jews seem to have been first directed to an area fairly far from the station, which Dr. Kasztner and Joel Brand designate with the name "brick-works," and where, although we cannot give an exact figure here either since they do not, it can be guessed that at a maximum it was possible to gather together about 10,000 persons. The official thesis: from there to the station, in columns of 3,000 men, women, children and the aged -- and baggage, as mentioned by all the witnesses who claim that the Jews took with them everything they could -- they were marched.

In any case, on this or that side of the Theiss, they had to be collected: by trucks or on foot to the nearest station and by rail from the nearest station to the assembling area. Oddly enough, at Budapest it was not the Jews of the city, for the most part Hungarian, who were rounded up at the "brick-works," but those from other regions who were fetched from 100 to 150 kilometers away. The "brick-works," moreover, could not hold more than 10,000 at a time -- officially deported in batches of 3,000 who were replaced by a similar number. In short, whether at the "brick-works" of Budapest or elsewhere, railcars had to be assembled, and these cars had to be drawn from the lot of 1,000 which, Kasztner tells us, were at the disposal of Eichmann. The two operations took place at the same time, because, at the assembly points, the Jews being deported could only be replaced by an equal number, so if they had to go as far to collect them as to deport them, each operation would have required an equal number of rail cars. But they were deported 500 to 550 kilometers away, at the most 600, and they went only 100 150 or 200 kilometers away to get them.

Therefore, only two-thirds of the cars could have been used for deporting, very few more. Let us say 700. And, we reason as follows: it took four days to get to

Auschwitz, four days to get back, and at least half a day to load and unload the 3,000; consequently, each train could not return empty to its point of departure to be ready to take off again, loaded, until the evening of the ninth day after its initial departure. At the rate of three trains of 40 cars each per day, the system must have bogged down after the sixth day, following the departure of the second train. At the rate of two trains a day, the operation would not be stopped for want of additional cars until the ninth day after the departure of the first train; the evening after the return of the first from Auschwitz, the second could leave again. Moreover, the system was able to function only on condition that it worked like a clock. (24)

Indeed, in what he recounted to Willem Sassen, and from whom Life (November 28 and December 12, 1960) drew the abominable stuff that was presented to its readers as authentic memoirs, Eichmann said that he only rarely succeeded in getting two trains per day out of Hungary. Is his statement not to be believed because it was to his interest to minimize? Of course, but to judge by the exhibits that were attached to the verdict which was handed down by the Jerusalem judges, his testimony is to be believed no less than that of the prosecution witnesses who, in the opposite sense, plainly did not deprive themselves of dramatizing it beyond all measure.

2. Number of persons per train. As with almost all facts from Jewish sources, the Court of the Jerusalem Tribunal is in flagrant disagreement with itself: it tells us, in "Exhibit 112," that the Jews were deported from Hungary at the rate of "about 3,000 per train" in "Exhibit 127" it states that there were no more than "on an average of 2,000 Jews per train." And, on this point, more than one oversight shows up this contention: it is not clear why -- if Eichmann, who was presented as eager to deport the greatest possible number of Jews, was in the habit of crowding together "about 3,000 persons per train" with "70 to 100 persons and even more per car," as is stated in "Exhibits 112 and 154" -- he only put 1,500 as "Exhibit 113" states, in the fully laden train to the camp at Kistarzca.

I recall that at Nuremberg Höss told Professor Gustave Gilbert that the convoys consisted of 1,500 persons, and, at the bar of the Tribunal, that they averaged 2,000 persons. Moreover, in his confession he spoke of "5 trains of 3,000 persons per day" but also that they "never carried more than 1,000 persons." But, Eichmann, still in what he told Sassen, claimed that he deported in all a maximum of 200,000 Jews from Hungary, but he gives no exact details about the numbers for each convoy. He noted the five trains per day that were mentioned by Höss, and on that occasion he said that he did not often achieve more than two at the most. He noted also the 3,000 per convoy and protested against that figure no less vehemently. But the 2,000 that Höss spoke about at Nuremberg did not startle him: he only said that it was quite a lot.

My opinion is, on the contrary, that the transportation of 2,000 persons in a single train of forty cars was quite possible. What is not possible was the transportation of 3,000 persons. How many less, then? Let us think about it a little: it is about 500 kilometers from Budapest to Auschwitz, and the trains took at least four days to cover this distance, at about 124 km per day. There were two reasons for this slow pace: first, they were not scheduled in the timetables -- "off the track" as railroad people say -- and they had to make long stops all along the way to let the regular trains through; second, the war was on, and during the months of May and June 1944, they were frequently halted by air attacks and were threatened also with partisan attacks. They

needed to be protected the whole way by both the stationary forces spread out at regular intervals from one end of the route to the other, and guards who had to travel with them. We have seen that to transport fewer than 1,600 persons in 16 cars from Compiègne to Buchenwald no less than 25 cars were necessary. Out of the 40 cars in a train leaving Hungary, it would very well be that a minimum of 10 were needed to carry more than two dozen people each along with their arms and their supplies for eight days. One hundred and fifty armed men for a convoy of 40 cars would be a minimum. In all that I have read about the deportation of the Hungarian Jews, I have never seen the slightest mention of this aspect of the problem. It is, however, well known that no convoy of that sort was ever sent off *unescorted* on any railway line by the Germans during the war. However resigned the Jews may have been to the fate that was in store for them and however sealed the cars may have been, at a speed of 125 kilometers per day, every unguarded train would have arrived at Auschwitz practically empty. Considering all that they were allowed to take along with them, they surely had whatever was necessary to saw, cut, and tear up all the boards of all the cars. And, that could be done without any risk, if there were no surveillance. But, 147 trains with about 150 guards for surveillance per train means that about 22,050 Hungarian gendarmes must have been employed since Eichmann's Kommando had only 150 men. Never anywhere has it been mentioned that S.S. units, the *Wehrmacht* or any other German army or police groups were sent to help him with this job.

I repeat my question: how many Jews? The answer: a maximum of 30 cars, loaded with Jews, per train -- 2,400 persons at 80 per car at the most. It is thus only the figure of 80 per car that is questionable. Once again, my personal testimony: I refer to a group of Hungarian Jews whose convoy, originally bound for Auschwitz, had arrived at Dora at the end of May 1944. Of the 1,500 or so people of this convoy, a certain number were sent to satellite camps around Dora as soon as they arrived. How many remained with us, I do not know; maybe they filled an entire block. Because of the racist policies of Nazism, they were to be completely isolated from the other prisoners. That block was surrounded with barbed wire. And from that protected block they went to work like everyone else, but as a separate Kommando. For them, assembly took place within the block, before their leaving for work and on their return. We envied them. Fifteen days after their arrival, if your clogs had been stolen in the night, if you wanted more bread, or if you required some tobacco or something else, you had only to make a quick dash to the Jewish block in the morning between reveille and roll-call, or in the evening before lights out, and, in exchange for something else, you could get just about anything you wanted: it was a regular market. We admired them; at the gate of the camp they had been made to undress completely, and had been sent to be disinfected; they went in completely naked, their contact with other prisoners was limited, and, all the same, they had succeeded in procuring a little of everything that could be gotten in the camp only with the greatest difficulties and at a very high price.

After a little while, the special surveillance over them became hardly more than a facade: once in a while we could exchange a few words with them, and even have short conversations. Thus it was that we learned about their odyssey. They told us about what they had had to leave behind when they came into the camp (25), and, since we were old hands in their eyes, they asked if they would get it back, when, how, and so on. They had been transported from Hungary to Dora, 70 to 80 persons in a car, with all of their baggage. They had made a long periplus of six to seven days

before arriving. They had been told when leaving that they were being taken to Auschwitz, and when they learned that it was at Dora that they would be unloaded, they were pleased. They told the most appalling things about Auschwitz. There were neither women nor children among them. The latter had been separated out on departure, and at the moment it did not surprise us since that is what happened to us.

From my personal observation, I have come to the following conclusion: the "70 to 100 persons and even more per car" of which "Exhibit 154" of the Jerusalem Court speaks, meant an average of 80 per car, the dividing up of the Jews having taken place in the cars or on the platform of the departure station on the basis of what they were carrying with them: more in one and fewer in another. With those "3,000 or so persons per train" we have, assuming that all the cars were occupied by Jewish deportees, an average of 75 per car, a fact to which "Exhibit 112" attests.

Not all the trains, however, had the same complement of Jews: the one destined for Kistarzca, which is mentioned in "Exhibit 113," was officially carrying only 1,500. It was probably also a train of 40 cars, with ten or so for surveillance and security, like all the others, or about 50 per car on the average... What is probable on the whole is that the human cargo, in reality, lay between the minimum of 1,500 indicated by Höss, and the possible maximum of 2,400. So that the average of 75 per car of "Exhibit 112" could be the general average, about 2,200 per train. In any case, that figure is plausible.

If it is true, as it is claimed, that Eichmann managed to deport about 200,000 Hungarian Jews in all, then this figure assumes that 32,000 Jews were deported on foot, and that the remaining 168,000 were deported by rail. About 77 trains would have been required during the 52 days that the deportation of Hungarian Jews lasted. This thesis -- in addition to supporting the 200,000 deportee figure -- has the advantage of being within the realm of technical possibility -- the very limit of what is possible with 1,000 cars. Since Eichmann said that he only rarely succeeded in getting two trains off per day, one could think that this is only the impression of a zealous employee who did not achieve the objective set him and who exaggerates his failure even to himself: 77 trains in 52 days, is still two trains per day, every other day. And, under the circumstances it was a fifty per cent success.

3. General Schedule of the Deportation of the Jews in Hungary:

March 19, 1944:.....800,000 Jews

End of November 1944, deported:.....200,000 Jews

Not deported:.....600,000 Jews

"Exhibit 111" of Jerusalem Trial refers to 57,000(26) dead in Hungary,

and no others are found in the Judgment:. 57,000 Jews

Survivors among those not deported:....543,000 Jews

The official statistics of the *World Center of Contemporary Jewish Documentation* mention only 200,000 survivors in 1945; the other 343,000, who were alive and who were without any doubt not all Hungarian, are listed in the statistics of those dead either in Hungary or in the other countries from whence they came. For those people not listed anywhere in any statistics of the living in Europe, and who are therefore not in Europe officially at least -- we had arrived at a total figure of 3,708,960, at the end of our study of the Czechoslovakian Jewish population. Hence, we now add the Hungarian Jews: 3,708,960 plus 343,000 gives us 4,051,960 who are living elsewhere -- with their offspring since 1945 -- if they are not in Europe. And of course we should add, as everywhere all those who returned alive from deportation, and are themselves in the same case.

Closely bound to Hungary is Yugoslavia, because of the stream of Jews who came from there, and Rumania, to which they were going. Yugoslavia herself is bound to Italy through the Jews who fled there.

Yugoslavia: we have seen that the *World Center of Contemporary Jewish Documentation* said there were 75,000 Jews there in 1939, of which only 20,000 were found still living in 1945. In April 1941 Yugoslavia was invaded by German troops and was cut into a number of pieces. Two states were created by the diplomacy of the Rome-Berlin Axis: Croatia was declared independent, and Serbia remained under German occupation. Italy received, besides Slovenia which she occupied, a large part of Croatia, where she systematically counteracted the anti-Jewish policy of the Pavelitch government, which was more Hitlerian than Mussolinian. Toward the East, the region of the upper Vardar, with Skoplje and Monastir, was handed over to Bulgaria. Within this puzzle, this is how the Jerusalem Tribunal ("Exhibits 105 and 106") divided up the Yugoslavian Jews: 30,000 in Croatia and 47,000 in Serbia, or a total of 77,000. No comment: we are accustomed to discrepancies in the Jewish sources. Another discrepancy: the Court of the Jerusalem Tribunal found that, according to "Exhibits 105 and 106," in 1945 there were still living only 1,500 Jews in Croatia and 5,000 in Serbia for a total of 6,500. From the preceding it would appear that the entire Jewish population of Slovenia, where -- because of the proximity of Trieste -- it has always been dense, must have fled into Croatia and into Serbia in order to be either closer to the Germans or right under their fist. After all, the Tribunal apparently found none there in 1945. In addition, it would seem that -- according to the Tribunal -- not one went to Hungary, where Dr. Kasztner found quite a large number of them, enough to note them in his *Report*. One might even be tempted to believe that 2,000 (the number that the Jerusalem Court found in excess of that number that was noted by the *World Center of Contemporary Jewish Documentation*) came from areas where there were no dangers, in order to be more certain of being exterminated. It has often been commented that the European Jews accepted their fate with great resignation; from the way the Jerusalem Tribunal told it, the Yugoslavian Jews were not only resigned, they were masochists.

Until the Jerusalem trial, Yugoslavia presented an enigma: an official spokesman of the *World Center of Contemporary Jewish Documentation*, Mr. Poliakov, explained to us (in *Bréviaire de la Haine* and *Le Troisième Reich et les Juifs*) that in Yugoslavia "the Jews took refuge by the thousands;" that in Croatia where Krumei had arrived on October 16, 1943, he did not succeed in deporting more Jews than did his colleague Alois Brunner, who managed to send 10,000 from Nice to the concentration camps

(27); and that after the *coup d'etat* of Badoglio (September 1943) the Jews had followed the Italian troops as they left Croatia. All this does not sit very well, as we see, with "Exhibits 105 and 106" of the Jerusalem judgment. They are in complete contradiction, in any case, both with the way the Jews were divided up among the various zones after the dismemberment, and with the number of deportees in Croatia, which "Exhibit 105" tells us numbered 28,500, all charged to Krumei except for 2,800.

Mr. Poliakov was just about mute on the subject of Serbia as to details: with the stamp of approval of the *World Center of Contemporary Jewish Documentation*, he declared, "No deportations in Serbia, all the Jews exterminated right there." He limited himself to stating that there were 20,000 survivors and 55,000 exterminated for the whole of Yugoslavia (*Bréviaire de la Haine*, p. 180). In order to get more precise details, other writers had to be turned to: Michel Borwicz, Joseph Billig, and others... But, unfortunately, in making a total out of all the details picked up, a figure of 30,000 was barely reached. And, hence, I came to the conclusion that the estimates of Mr. Poliakov were without any basis, and therefore pure fantasy. On the other hand, the figure of 30,000 could be supported by plausible proofs. However, Mr. Poliakov was surely correct concerning the Jews in Croatia, and so it was the Jews of Serbia who had paid the heaviest toll in deportation and death. Furthermore, it was logical: the Germans had been hunting them down since 1941, and even if they did not deport them until 1942 they were all set to, the minute the order was given.

By following the events in the order in which they took place, another discovery was made: the statistics drawn up at the end of 1941 for the Wannsee Conference by Mr. Richard Korherr -- therefore before deportation steps were taken in Yugoslavia (28) -- mentioned 40,000 Jews at that time in the whole of Yugoslavia. One could only conclude that 75,000 minus 40,000 or 35,000 had fled to Hungary and Italy since they were no longer there and had not been arrested. And, if we deduce that it was out of those 40,000 that the 30,000 or so mentioned as having been arrested had been taken, it is logical. And, in Serbia -- since, with the exception of about 10,000 -- the Croats had followed the retreating Italian troops since September 1943; that is logical, too.

The *World Center of Contemporary Jewish Documentation*, then, had no factual basis for putting more than 30,000 Jews in the column of the exterminated -- assuming that they all were, after having been arrested -- in their statistics. They placed the number at 55,000, or 25,000 too many. Given the fact that the number of Yugoslavian Jews who were arrested and who are dead, beyond the justified figure of 30,000, has already been included in the results of the calculations on the Hungarian Jews and that the remainder will be included in the calculations which will be made for Italy, it can be said that here are another 25,000 living European Jews to add to the 4,051,960 Jews who we found to be living at the end of the study of the Hungarian Jewish population: Thus, the total now amounts to 4,076,960.

Italy: Mr. Arthur Ruppin says there were 50,000 Jews there in 1926, and the *World Center of Contemporary Jewish Documentation* gives 57,000 for 1939. The latter figure is very possible : figuring a natural rate of increase of thirteen per cent, we get 56,500. Let us accept 57,000. We have, however, to add the 16,500 Yugoslavian Jews who fled there, so we have 73,500. In 1945 the *World Center of Contemporary Jewish Documentation* found 15,000 deportees exterminated and 42,000 living. Logically the

Center should have found 58,500 survivors, and the overstatement on the number of deaths should have been 16,500. Actually, the overstatement of deaths was even more significant since even Mr. Rolf Hochhuth, who recently distinguished himself with that fraudulent writing on the theme of the Gerstein Document, *Der Stellvertreter*, found only 8,000 Jews arrested and deported in Italy and since the judges at Jerusalem found only "7,500 deportees of whom no more than 600 survived" ("Exhibit 109"), or 6,900 exterminated. In this case, the number of survivors should be 73,500 minus 6,900 or 66,600. And, the overstatement of the World Center of Contemporary Jewish Documentation is 66,000 minus 42,000 or 24,600. To be added to the total of 4,076,960, whom we found to be still living after we completed the study of the Yugoslavian Jewish population and who are no longer -- at least, officially -- in Europe, is this 24,600 which yields 4,101,560.

Rumania: Mr. Arthur Rupp counted 900,000 Jews in 1926, and the *World Center of Contemporary Jewish Documentation* found no more than 850,000 in 1939 (a figure with which the *Institute of Jewish Affairs* agrees, but for which Mr. Raul Hilberg gives only 800,000). There is nothing unusual in that since the Jewish population has always emigrated from Rumania in large numbers. Concerning the number of deportees exterminated and the number of survivors, the *World Center* says half and half, the *Institute* agrees except for 5,000 each, and Hilberg is, naturally, in total disagreement; there were 380,000 survivors and 420,000 exterminated, he says. Another thing that points up how conscientious all these people are: the writer of the statistics for the *World Center of Contemporary Jewish Documentation* is, as we know, Mr. Poliakov, and, commenting on the figures of his own statistics (*Bréviaire de la Haine*, p. 186), he tells us that in 1939 there were 700,000 Jews in Rumania, and in 1945 only 250,000 (*op. cit.* P. 188). "Exhibit 110" of the Jerusalem Court summing up the story of the Rumanian Jews is very prudent: "In this way about half of Rumanian Judaism was saved from extermination," it states, basing its decision on the written deposition of Dr. Safran, Chief Rabbi of Rumania, but without any reference to what that deposition contained.

For the rest, if the one who drew up that document was attempting to show that no Rumanian Jew had ever been deported by the Germans, he could not have succeeded better. In fact, only one deportation project for 200,000 Jews is cited, decided upon for the first time on July 26, 1942, to start on the following 16th of September; it was discussed a second time on September 17th; then on the 26th and the 28th of September, the Germans and the Rumanians finally reached agreement on the details of the project. But on the 22nd of October, when the deportations were not yet under way, the Rumanian government changed its mind and told the Germans that it would take charge of the Jewish problem in Rumania by itself.

Until then, the German policy had been precisely that the Rumanians should themselves take charge of their own Jews, and the whole of the diplomatic correspondence between the two governments attests to the fact that the Rumanians had not ceased proposing to the Germans that they turn the Jews over to them, but without success; the Germans did not want them. And, when the time came when they did want them, the Rumanians no longer were willing to turn them over.

The Chief Rabbi of Rumania claims in his deposition -- at least according to the writers of the press reports of the Jerusalem Trial -- that until August 1942 the

Rumanians, who did not succeed in getting their Jews accepted by the Germans, exterminated them. He cited massacres of Odessa Jews by the Rumanian army (60,000 victims), pogroms at Bucharest, Ploesti, Jassy, Constanza, and "victims by the tens of thousands," but he gave no other details. On the whole he estimated that from February 1941 to August 1942 ("250,000 to 300,000 Jews were exterminated" by the Rumanians and *not by the Germans*).

This idea is highly contestable. At Paris during the same period, everyone with whom I was associated and who was familiar with the system of escape lines for European Jews during the war knew -- from the Jews themselves, with whom they were in contact -- that in Rumania, although the government did not show any particular sympathy, they were at least given tourist passports for a fee of \$1,000 each with which they could move on. The Chief Rabbi affirms that it was only after October 1942 that this policy was put into practice. This date corresponds precisely with the change of policy of the Antonescu government which, suddenly, after having for so long begged the Germans to take the Jews that they wanted to turn over to them, refused to do so when the Germans were ready to accept. Mme. Hannah Arendt echoes this fact (*The New Yorker*, March 16, 1963). The information that we in Paris had about this was out of line in only one detail: the price for the passport was, it seems, not \$ 1,000, but \$1,300.

This contention that half of Rumanian Judaism (or 425,000 out of 850,000) was exterminated due to the deportation by the Germans reveals a difference between "250,000 to 300,000" and 425,000 of some 125,000 to 175,000 Rumanian Jews. It is most questionable for another reason too: the territorial changes that were made in Rumania between 1939 and 1945.

In August 1939, the Russo-German Pact forced Rumania to pay a heavy tribute to the contractants and to their allies, namely to turn over northern Bukovina and Bessarabia to the USSR (June 1940); a significant part of Transylvania to Hungary; and Dobroudja to Bulgaria (August 1940). The movement of the Jewish populations from these areas, when the transfers took place, has never been studied, to my knowledge. The generally held contention is that they stayed where they were or that few moved away. There were, moreover, agreements about moving people which were not all settled when the German-Russian conflict began in June 1941. I refer those readers who are interested in these agreements to the excellent work of the National Institute of Statistics and Economics of Paris, which came out in 1946, , with the title, *Les Transferts Internationaux de populations* (Presses Universitaires de France).

Naturally, Rumania had been waiting since 1940 for a chance, as the relations between Germany and Russia deteriorated, to get back the territories which she had lost, particularly Bessarabia which was more likely than others to be obtained. In June, 1941, she went into the war against Russia on the side of the Axis, and as a result, she got back not only Bessarabia but was also given an occupation zone which was called Transnistria and which extended out from the 1939 frontier and from the Dniester to the Bug. Germany took for herself the zone beyond, from the Bug to the Dnieper.

Naturally, too, in evacuating Bukovina and Bessarabia, the Russians also evacuated as much of the population as possible, which, of course, was fleeing in all directions

before the German troops. At any rate, from the 11th to the 21st of December 1943, the International Red Cross sent one of its delegates, Mr. Charles Kolb, to Rumania. He stayed there from December 11, 1943, to January 14, 1944. On his return he drew up a report in which he noted that 206,700 Jews were missing in Bessarabia-Transnistria, and 88,600 in Bukovina. Otherwise, he observed nothing abnormal. From this report it is possible to assume that all of these 295,300 Rumanian Jews, now Russian, who found themselves on the Russian lines, had fled before the German troops just as their Polish co-religionists did in 1939 and were saved from deportation at the hands of the Germans. One can assume it, but it cannot be stated with certainty. In any case, Mr. Poliakov, who cites this report (Bréviaire de la Haine, p. 371) concedes "that just before the German attack, a portion of the Jewish population may have been evacuated by the Russians." Anyway, since this report was based on investigations made in 1943-1944, at a time when the Jews were no longer in any danger in Rumania, and since he does not record one missing elsewhere, it can be assumed with certainty that at that date 800,000 minus 295,300 or 504,700, were still living, and were neither arrested, deported, nor massacred afterwards. One can assume this with all the more assurance since it is more or less supported by "Exhibit 119" of the Jerusalem court, which mentions no deportation of Rumanian Jews by the Germans; even if it had, such a deportation could only have taken place before October 22, 1942, which is to say that it could not have taken place, since until then, the Germans had consistently refused to give in to the pleas of the Rumanian government to take its Jewish population.

It is an odd coincidence that these 295,300 Jews, which Mr. Charles Kolb said were not in Rumania, are numerically within the limits of the "295,000 to 300,000" claimed by the Chief Rabbi to have been exterminated by the Rumanians. One is led to the thought that they are the same, and that in order to hang Antonescu, the Russians who saved them claimed he had exterminated them.

As for Mr. Raul Hilberg, he is even more subtle. After having examined the misdeeds of the *Einsatzgruppen* in Russia and after having integrated into the statistics on Russia the Jews they allegedly exterminated in cities such as Odessa, Chisinau and Cernauti, he counts those who were missing in Transnistria, which is where Odessa was between 1941 and 1944 and in Bukovina where the other two were, by putting them in with the statistics for Rumania (p. 485-509); that is, he counts them twice.

Conclusion on Rumania: in order to know exactly how many Jews should be reported as missing in 1945, we should know just as exactly how many of the 295,300, counted as missing by Mr. Charles Kolb at the end of December and the beginning of January 1944, were evacuated by the Russians, and how many remained under the yoke of the Germans or Rumanians. However, we do not know this. We should also know how many emigrated, and there must have been quite a number because of all Jews the Rumanian Jews were in the best position, having the least distance to go, with the least effort, to get out of Europe. But, if the Russians had saved half of those counted as missing by Mr. Charles Kolb, and if the other half fallen into the hands of the Rumanians, had been massacred in the pogroms in Odessa, Bucharest, Ploesti, Constanza, and other places, the Rumanian Jewish population of 1939 might be apportioned as follows:

- a. massacred:.....147,650
- b. saved by the Russians:.....147,650
- c. emigrated, or found living in 1945
(800,000 - 295,300):.....504,700
- d. total number of survivors:.....652,350
- e. officially found still living by the World Center of Contemporary
Jewish Documentation:.....425,000
- f. overstatement of those exterminated:..227,350

These 227,350, although still living in 1945, have been improperly added to the column of exterminated by the *World Center of Contemporary Jewish Documentation*. Consequently, we have 227,350 more European Jews to be added to the 4,101,560, in the same situation, who were found at the end of our study of the Italian Jewish population. At this point of our work, the total should read: 4,328,901.

Bulgaria: The statistics which appear on page 300 mention that the Jewish population of Bulgaria in 1939 was 50,000. And, the *World Center of Contemporary Jewish Documentation* has accepted this figure as representing the prewar Jewish population. The World Center claims that 7,000 Bulgarian Jews were exterminated during the war. Mr. Raul Hilberg found only some 3,000 missing, and "Exhibit No. 108" of the Jerusalem Tribunal mentions 4,000 deportees from Thrace and 7,000 from Macedonia, for a total of 11,000, but nothing is said about losses. This claim of 11,000 deportees is not supported by any exact facts; it is not known when they were deported or where they were sent. As for Mr. Poliakov, commenting upon the World Center figures of which he is the author, he cannot even cite them correctly: he claimed some 13,000 deportees out of a total Jewish population of 20,000. In addition, he says nothing about survivors. Returning to the statistics of the World Center, there is no problem in determining the number of survivors: 50,000 Jews in 1939 less 7,000 of them who were exterminated leaves a total of 43,000. Giving the World Center the benefit of the doubt and accepting its estimation of losses, there is no exaggeration of casualties to be added to the total that was found at the end of our study of Rumania.

Greece: At one time the official statistics took separate note of Macedonia where some 7,000 Jews were supposedly deported, but there was no mention of how many were there in 1939. Since then, this particular contention has disappeared from the official statistics, and Greece alone remains with 75,000 in 1939, with 60,000 deportees exterminated in 1945, and, therefore, with 15,000 survivors. Mr. Raul Hilberg gives the following figures: 74,000 in 1939, 62,000 exterminated, and 12,000 survivors. "Exhibit 107" of the Jerusalem Tribunal mentions 80,000 in 1939, 70,000 exterminated and 10,000 survivors. Finally, Mr. Arthur Ruppin had already taken a census of 75,000 Jews in Greece in 1926. Could Jewish emigration equal the natural rate of increase? It is possible.

Greece was divided into two zones of occupation: to the north were the Germans, who had their general headquarters in Salonika; to the south were the Italians who had theirs at Athens. The Jews were proportioned like this: 55,000 to 60,000 persons concentrated around Salonika in the German zone and 15,000 to 20,000 in the Italian zone concentrated around Athens. All the Jewish sources are in agreement in saying that the Germans did not do anything about the Greek Jews until July 1942 when they made them wear the yellow star and this only in the German zone. In the Italian zone, nothing changed. It was only in February 1943 that the policy of collecting them into the ghettos of Salonika and the surrounding areas began. These steps were taken by Dr. Max Merten -- administrator of the zone, with the help of two men sent from the R.S.H.A., Wisliceny and Gunther -- from the 15th of January 1943 on. Mr. Poliakov claims (*op. cit.*, p. 182) that the first deportation began on March 15, 1943, and ended on May 9th; 43,000 Jews in convoys were deported to Auschwitz (with 2,700 persons per convoy, one convoy every 3 or 4 days, means that here, where the Jews were massed, the work of deportation did not go on as fast as in Hungary where the ungrouped Jews were allegedly deported at the rate of 2 to 3 convoys of 3,000 per day). The remainder, or at least about 12,000, were deported from July to August 1943 in three convoys. At that rate, there must have been about 4,000 persons per convoy at the least. The trip from Salonika to Auschwitz lasted an average of 10 days, and, as Mr. Poliakov claims, on arrival the Jews were sent directly in a group to the gas chamber, without any prior selecting out of the able-bodied since they were in so bad a state. This is, in fact, what Wisliceny, taking the theme from Höss, commandant of the camp, claimed at Nuremberg, but Höss did not confirm it! "Exhibit 107" of the Jerusalem Tribunal is not in agreement with this aspect of the deportation of Greek Jews: "The 56,000 Jews of the Salonika region were all deported from March 15th to the end of May 1943," it says; therefore, there were no convoys in July-August, but it does not state precisely the number of convoys nor the number of persons per convoy. The attorney, Max Merten (who was sentenced to 25 years in prison in 1946, but set at liberty almost at once, and who was a witness for the defense at the, Jerusalem Trial) claimed that thanks to Eichmann, and in spite of Wisliceny's efforts to thwart him, about 20,000 Jews escaped deportation. Furthermore, he claimed that between the time that they were forced to wear the yellow star (July 1942), and the beginning of their concentration into ghettos (February 1943), many Jews in the German Zone went over into the Italian zone. He added that, since he was not in harmony with the deportation measures envisaged because the Jews were giving him no trouble, he not only saw no objection but he even helped their flight as much as he could without attracting the attention of Wisliceny and Gunther. That is why, after having been sentenced to 25 years in prison, he was freed almost immediately.

In the Italian zone, the Jews were not alarmed until after Badoglio's *coup d'etat* in September 1943. Then, deportation operations were assigned to Wisliceny and Gunther. Before the Bratislava Tribunal which sentenced him to death, the former claimed (June 27, 1947) in a written deposition that 8,000 to 10,000 of the Jews in that zone had been deported. For the city of Athens, according to "Exhibit 107" of the Jerusalem Court, a large number were nevertheless warned in time to hide themselves and to flee, so that no more than 12,000 remained." So all the others had to be looked for and gathered together in the first place. In order to deport 8,000 to 10,000 Wisliceny had to apply himself in earnest, and we see that he did not try to mitigate his guilt. Let us accept the figure and reason thusly: we do not know how many Jews succeeded in passing from the German into the Italian zone, but we do know that

those in the former zone were deported in 19 convoys, and that after that there were no more. At an average of 2,200 per train of 40 cars, an estimation that was established and used in our calculations for Hungary, we come to a total of 41,800. This means that there were 14,200 who had fled into the Italian zone, figured by subtracting 41,800 from 56,000 (the figure given by the Jerusalem Court for the number deported from the German zone). Consequently, the Jewish population of that zone should have been 33,200 figured by subtracting 56,000 from 75,000 and adding 14,200 to the remainder. If Wisliceny did deport 8,000 to 10,000, there must have been left over 33,200 minus 8,000 to 10,000, or 23,200 to 25,200 survivors for the whole of Greece.

Therefore, the minimum overstatement of the *World Center of Contemporary Jewish Documentation* is 10,200. (This figure allows for the 15,000 Jews who were already in the Italian zone.) And, that only on condition that the 19 trains really did leave Salonika, each carrying about 2,200 persons, which is possible, but not likely. By adding this 10,200 to the total at the end of the study of the Rumanian Jewish population, we get 4,339,110.

The following countries remain to be looked into: Germany, Austria, Denmark, and Norway.

Germany was already mentioned in connection with the Jewish population of Holland, Belgium, Luxemburg, and France. It will be remembered that at the time of the invasion of France by German troops, figures from Jewish sources showed that there were 252,000 foreign Jews in France whose nationality it was impossible to determine, except to say that outside of the thirty or, at the most, forty or so thousand who were German, the rest were all Polish. By looking only at the European survivors, there was no objection in stating that they were all Polish (or all German) because they could not be allotted. But now we must take into account the fact that 40,000 German Jews were already counted, unless we want to count them twice.

So, in 1939, this was the structure of the German Jewish population: 210,000 remained in Germany because 300,000 out of 510,000 emigrated, according to the *World Center of Contemporary Jewish Documentation*. Mr. Raul Hilberg says: 240,000 remained in Germany and 300,000 out of 540,000 emigrated. Taking account of the natural rate of increase this ought to be closer to the truth, but there is another factor to be considered: from 1926 to 1933, Mr. Poliakov tells us (*Bréviaire de la Haine*, p. 11) that the demographic curve of Jewish communities, worried about their fate in the face of the rise of Hitlerism, was on the decline. Therefore, let us say that there were 210,000 Jews in Germany in 1939. Officially only 40,000 should have been found still living in 1945, which would mean that 170,000 were exterminated.

To the support of the details which he brings forth to justify these 170,000 exterminated and these 40,000 survivors, Mr. Poliakov refers to the statistics compiled at Himmler's request, on April 17, 1943, for the date of December 31, 1942, which he speaks of as having been "prepared with great competence" (*Bréviaire de la Haine*, pp. 383-384). I am of this opinion: the German demographer Korherr seems to have been a competent man and that is why I, too, have come to refer to his data; however, he has a troublesome tendency to see a few too many Jews everywhere. But, except for this, if I accept the picture of German Judaism as he saw it for December

31, 1942, I really do not see how Mr. Poliakov, who also accepts it, has been able to draw from it the conclusions he does. This is what we find in the recapitulative table about the German Jews:

Arrested up to December 31, 1942:.....100,516

Not yet arrested:..... 51,327

Total:.....151,843

It is true that this total is shown as concerning the "former *Reich* and the Sudetenland," but that is without significance: on May 17, 1937, there were only 2,649 Jews in the Sudetenland, the rest having fled to Bohemia-Moravia, then to Hungary, or elsewhere. Except for about a thousand, the figure pertains only to Germany. I repeat: Mr. Poliakov accepts these figures. But if there were only 151,843 in Germany on December 31, 1942, (free or in concentration camps) and if they had been able to arrest in all only 100,516, then 210,000 minus 151,843 or 58,157 had been able to emigrate after 1939. That also means that after December 31, 1942, it had not been possible to arrest more than 51,327. The following July 1st, it was finished: the law declaring Germany "*Juden frei*" (free of Jews) was promulgated, and Mr. Poliakov tells us, "not a single Jew remained at liberty except those married to Aryans," (p. 68) and these, Mr. Richard Korherr tells us in his report, numbered 16,760. We know that later they were in their turn arrested and deported -- officially, at least.

Now let us correct the error which we deliberately made, when the problem had to be solved by the elementary process of the false supposition, in stating that the 40,000 European Jews who were found living in Holland, France, Belgium, and Luxemburg were Polish, although we knew that they were not. It is among the 58,157 Jews who left Germany after 1939 and before December 31, 1943, that they are to be found, and they were included in the study of the Polish Jewish population. If we do not want to have them counted twice, they must be withdrawn from the number of German emigrants, and we must only count among the number of the latter: 58,157 minus 40,000, or 18,157.

Next, we can figure the maximum number of German Jews who were arrested and who were deported and never came back. If out of the 151,843, the *World Center of Contemporary Documentation* found 40,000 survivors in 1945, then that means that 151,843 minus 40,000, or, 111,843 never returned, or had not returned by 1945. And, since the *World Center* shows 170,000 Jews in the column of the exterminated, that figure is an overstatement of some 58,157. Consequently, the total number of German Jews who were considered dead, who are no longer officially in Germany, nor in Europe, but who are alive, and who should be included in the column of the living in other countries and in other continents is 76,314. The addition of this 76,314 to the total at the end of the study of the Greek Jewish population gives us 4,415,424, who must be added to the survivor column.

I hope that I shall be excused for having considered the German Jews without any reference to the Jerusalem Trial: Exhibits 56, 57, 75, 77, 83, 90 and 91, which provide

the calculations, barely account for 10 to 15 thousand who were allegedly arrested and deported. It would be ridiculous even to take them into consideration (29).

Austria: for 1939 the *World Center of Contemporary Jewish Documentation* speaks of 60,000 Jews as still being there (with this figure based on an emigration of 180,000 after Hitler came to power in Germany, out of 240,000) and of 20,000 survivors in 1945, or 40,000 exterminated. Mr. Arthur Ruppin counted 230,000 Austrian Jews in 1926 -- the same situation as for the German Jews in relation to the demographic curve and the natural increase.

The Zionist writing concerning the drama of the Austrian Jews is not very abundant. The Austrian Jews were also neglected by the Jerusalem Tribunal. Studied together with the Jews of Germany and Bohemia-Moravia, and in the same Exhibits, this Tribunal said that there were 5,000 arrests and deportations on October 15, 1941, and 3,000 more on the 25th and 28th of November and December 2nd of the same year. In 1943-1944, the *Kasztner Report* and Joel Brand take note of a clandestine Jewish community, relatively little disturbed. They do not give the number of individuals in this community, but, judging by the way in which it is referred to, it must have been significant. "Exhibit 97" of the Jerusalem Court mentions that, in Austria, arrests and deportations were not within the competence of the R.S.H.A. as everywhere else, but of the *Jewish Emigration Center*, which was set up in Vienna in 1938 by Eichmann and which existed throughout the war. That certainly explains why they were tracked and persecuted less zealously and with less brutality. Dated December 31, 1942, the statistics of Mr. Korherr say that in all 47,655 Jews were arrested and that 8,102 remained at liberty. As a total, and all during the war, then, there were 55,757 Jews in Austria, which means that there were only 4,243 émigrés after 1939. That also means that if only 20,000 out of these 55,757 Jews were found living in 1945, the overstatement of the *World Center of Contemporary Jewish Documentation* would only amount to those 4,243 who emigrated after 1939, but who are incorrectly listed as dead. I emphasize: if only 20,000 were found still living. However, I have already shown that the balance of Jewish losses was determined between May and October 1945 -- Mr. Poliakov says it is dated August (*Le Troisième Reich et les Juifs*, p. 196) - - in order to be available to Justice Jackson in time, and, in the jungle of displaced persons which central Europe was then, many Jews who had been deported and who were living had not gotten back to their former domiciles in time to be counted. All these were accounted for as dead, and since then, if they have been found still living in their domiciles or elsewhere (many never went back), no corrections were ever made in the statistics.

My conclusions for Austria are that 4,243 European Jews *surely* must be reintegrated into the column of living in the statistics for 1945, and must be added to the preceding total, giving a new total of 4,419,667.

And, to finish up, we shall examine **Denmark** and **Norway**: There were 7,000 Jews in Denmark and 1,500 in Norway in 1939, according to the *World Center of Contemporary Jewish Documentation*, or a total of 8,500 for the two countries. The same source gives the total number of exterminated as being 500 in Denmark (since in the days just before the day fixed for their arrest, the Danish government, which knew about it, forwarned the national Jewish community), and 900 in Norway for a total of

1,400. The Jerusalem Court gives the losses down to the last person: 737 in Norway and 422 in Denmark, or, 1,159.

The exaggeration of the *World Center of Contemporary Jewish Documentation* is 241. This exaggeration can be attributed to rounding out the figures, and is not intentional. But still it must be added to the preceding total, of which it can be said (with the exception of the 480,000 German and Austrian Jews who emigrated before 1939 and who were accounted for and considered living in 1945) that it is the general total of European Jews *improperly* inscribed in the column of exterminated in the statistics of the *World Center of Contemporary Jewish Documentation*: 4,419,667 plus 241, or, 4,419,908.

FOOTNOTES

(1) *Die Welt* does not say so, but these estimates are taken from a study which was put out a few days before by the *Jewish Communities of the World*, official organ of the World Jewish Congress. They were published by the *Jerusalem Post Weekly* on April 19, 1963, and after that on various dates by the entire world press. It may be pointed out that for the year 1962, the *World Almanac* of 1963 (p. 259) gives the world Jewish population as 12,296,180. In other words, compared to 1959, not only did the world Jewish population not increase, it decreased.

(2) Arthur Ruppin was in charge of the course in Jewish Sociology at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem. His major work, *Les Juifs dans le Monde moderne*, from which the *Menorah Journal* got its figures, was not published in France until 1934.

(3) Actually in the above statistics, the World Center for Contemporary Jewish Documentation had question marks in place of losses for Bulgaria, and had omitted Luxemburg. It was only later that exact information concerning these two countries were given officially, and I was not able to take them into account in *Ulysse trahi par les siens*.

(4) They are derived from the statistics on page 670 of his book, but on page 767, they are given as 5,100,000, as has already been noted.

(5) In that version of the genealogy of peoples, the Arabs, who are also descended from Noah -- like everyone in the world, to be sure! -- but via the relations of Abraham with Agar, servant of his wife Sarah, are considered the illegitimate branch, and we who are only descended from Japhet, as well as those descended from Chanaan, cursed by the Old Man, are considered only as side branches, the last of the line of descendants, degenerated, and in addition forever discredited for having fallen into the heresies. That is the basic justification for the qualification "chosen people," as Israel claims -- thank you, no for us! -- and this is taught as an historical truth in all Hebrew universities on the threshold of the 21st century!

(6) [The precise figure which is cited in *Religious Bodies*, Vol. II, Part 1 (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1941) for the American Jewish population in 1926 is 4,081,242 persons.]

(7) Before this date, the Visigoth King Siebrut had chased them out of Spain (613) along with all who were of oriental origin, and King Dagobert of France (629), had done the same, but these banishments were of short duration.

(8) They were banished and forced out of England in 1220, from France in 1394, from Spain in 1492.

(9) The *Jerusalem Post Weekly* (April 19, 1963) gives 2.3 million. On the other hand, in his book, *Le Peuple et l'Etat d'Israel*, Mr. Ben Gurion gives 2 million for 1958 (p. 66). If there were only 2.045 or 2.05 million in 1962, it shows that not only was the normal population increase of 1 per cent per year not reached in Israel, but also that immigration had been halted. Perhaps one could even speak of emigration.

(10) [Here, Professor Rassinier takes the rate of natural population increase of one per cent per year and computes the entire increase over the given term in a single calculation (e.g., the sum of 174,610 is multiplied by 31 per cent to yield the natural growth over a period of thirty-one Years). This method is used throughout the entire study. Although this simplified method produces adequate approximations, the estimation of the natural population growth would be more precise if the one per cent increase for each year were added to the figure for the preceding year with one per cent then taken of the new total, with the procedure being repeated for each year of the given term. For example, the natural growth from 1931 to 1962, as figured in item "a" is 63,091 (or an increase of about 36 per cent) when the latter method is used. Likewise, a natural increase of 101,249 (or 16 per cent) is achieved instead of 94,350 for item "b." Because it is felt that Professor Rassinier's "shorthand" method of calculating population growth resulted in approximations which are of sufficient accuracy for the purpose of this study, his calculations have not been changed.]

(11) If the figuring were done on the basis of the natural increase rate of 1.25% (or 20% every 16 years) of Professor Salo Baron, the global increase for the period of 1931-1962 would be carried to 523,308 individuals, or an increase of 92,046, and the number of immigrants actually living in the country diminished by as much, or 1,444,128 minus 92,046 equal 1,352,082.

(12) In a work intended for students of the college for Higher Economic Studies (*Principes et tendances de la planification rurale en Israel*, Paris, (1963) Professor Albert Meister claims that "one immigrant out of ten in Israel (or 10%) would return into the Diaspora "after a brief sojourn.

(13) When the airplanes in many trips brought them back to the Promised Land, which they no longer hoped to see, and whose location most of them no longer knew, as Leon Uris just about says in *Exodus*, they at first thought it was the end of the world as proclaimed in the Scriptures, "The day when men shall fly." And they arrived in Israel to discover such other unsuspected things as a table, a chair or a fork, etc ... but at the same time they came with the conviction of being "the Chosen People," destined in the twentieth century to take the future of the world in charge.

(14) In order to spare the reader, the steps in this calculation do not appear. If he feels the need of verifying it himself, he can make use of the method which appears earlier in this chapter.

(15) [If Arthur Rupp's figure of 4,500,000 Jews living in the United States in 1926 had been used instead of the official census figure, a total Jewish population for 1962 -- exclusive of immigration -- of 6,120,000 persons would be had, using the natural growth coefficient of one per cent annually. If Salo Baron's coefficient had been used, the 1962 figure would be 6,804,000 persons, once again exclusive of immigration.]

(16) However, the *World Almanac* of 1945 takes note of only 240,000, p. 494.

(17) It was another one of the machiavellianisms of Nuremberg that every time that the prosecution brought forth an accusation for which they would not or could not give the source they used the expression "in full cognizance" or "from an assured source" -- that was generally the case when the source was Jewish -- and it was up to the accused to prove their innocence. At Nuremberg it was not up to the prosecution to prove guilt since the Allies recognized early that their adherence to the Anglo-American jurisprudential presumption of "innocent until proven guilty" would deny them the "convictions" which they sought.

(18) The Czechoslovakian Jews who went into Hungary were arrested there together with their Polish and Yugoslav coreligionists without any nationality distinctions being drawn. The survivors and the deportees as listed in the calculations concerning Hungary cannot be distinguished either, since there are no records. This could be significant with regard to losses by nationality, but is not for losses of a general European nature, and that is what we are investigating.

(19) The Jerusalem Tribunal has 480,000 in its "Exhibit No. 111."

(20) This figure is confirmed by "Exhibit No. 111" of the Jerusalem Tribunal.

(21) Dr. Kasztner says 300,000 ("800,000 of which 500,000 were deported," page 1 of his *Report*.)

(22) Figure given by Dr. Kasztner as coming to him from Eichmann himself.

(23) In France and in Germany, freight cars are larger than in Poland, Czechoslovakia and Hungary. I learned this by experience when we were evacuated from Dora in April 1945, with 80 per car in a train composed at least half of such cars, we were just as crowded with 80 in a Polish car as we were with 100 in a French car.

(24) We can see then what would have happened under Joel Brand's system: "Every day" he told the Jews in Constantinople, when he met with them towards the 18th of June, 1944, "12,000 Jews are thrown into the cars." (*Histoire de Joel Brand*, p. 125). Conclusion: four trains per day, and the system exhausted the supply of empty railroad cars before the evening of the 5th day!

(25) At Auschwitz, the "baggage" collected in this manner by the administration of the camp was gathered into a corner of the camp which, according to the official plans produced at Nuremberg and other trials, was composed of 30 blocks separate from each other and heavily guarded: "Canada" they were called by the deportees. The official view was that on the approach of the Russian army, the S.S. tried to set fire to them but did not succeed. On their arrival, the Russian troops found in the six blocks

set aside for clothing: 348,820 outfits for men, 836,525 outfits for women, but only 5,255 pairs of shoes for men, and 38,000 pairs of shoes for women. There were also 13,694 rugs. (Auschwitz, *Official Communication of the Museum of the Auschwitz Commission* -- Panstwowe Museum W. Oswiecimiu -- published in Cracow in 1947). That gives an idea of all that the Jews brought with them. Women remained women even in the worst circumstances: compare what was found on them with what was found on the men. Other barracks contained objects of all sorts of value. The commission does not give an enumeration, or an estimate of the market value, but trains and trucks were required to transport it all. All these things must have taken up a great deal of space in the cars "of 70 to 100 persons and even more" mentioned in "Exhibit 154" of the Jerusalem trial. Conclusion: in the cars of the Jews who carried with them the most goods, there were fewer persons, and in the others more than expected.

(26) Actually, it said: 57,000 to 62,000.

(27) In the *Bréviaire de la Haine*, he even specified "3,000 deportees in all from Croatia." (p. 181.)

(28) Deportation of the Jews from Yugoslavia was decided upon on January 19, 1943, for Croatia, but was not seriously begun until after the arrival of Krumej, on October 16, 1943; deportations were begun in March, 1942 in Serbia.

(29) Still, the method of the judges at Jerusalem must be emphasized: the case of the German Jews is treated in their verdict -- in the aggregate -- together with Austrian Jews and those of Bohemia-Moravia. To cover up the ridiculous aspect of the number of German Jews which they were taking into consideration, and contrary to the system they used for other countries, they did not total them. In order to give the impression that there was a great number, they included among the German Jews, the 55,000 Polish Jews who were in Germany, when on October 7, 1938, the Polish government decided to deprive them of Polish nationality by not renewing their passports. By this act they were depatriated, and the Germans at that time did not want people without passports on their land. Nor, did the Poles, who had depatriated them. Since no other country wanted them either, it was a very bad state of affairs. It was the origin of the assassination of Counsellor vom Rath in Paris on November 7, 1938, by Grynspan, a son of one of these 55,000 Poles, and of the "*Kristallnacht*" of November 9th and 10th in Germany.

Chapter Fifteen

Conclusion: Six Million Exterminated Jews -- Fact or Fiction

Logic demands that this demographic study end with general statistics which include the following four items for each of the European nations which I have surveyed:

1. The number of Jews who were living there just before Beck's accession to power in Poland (1932) and Hitler's accession to power in Germany (1933);
2. The number of Jews among them who, to escape persecution, emigrated between 1932 and 1945;
3. The number of Jews who remained in Europe and who were still alive there in 1945;
4. The number of Jews who cannot be accounted for and who, hence, are presumed to be dead.

In order to give the exact truth of this dark story, these statistics should be accompanied by others giving the structure of the world Jewish population at the end of 1962. And, in four sections also, for each of the nations of the other continents:

1. The number of Jews living there before the rise to power in Poland of Beck, and in Germany of Hitler;
2. The natural increase in the Jewish population from 1932 to 1962;
3. The census of the Jewish population at the end of 1962;
4. The number of Jewish immigrants calculated from the difference between the total figures of items 2 and 3. (There is no doubt that this difference comes near the 4,419,908 figure that is mentioned in the preceding section.)

This was my intention at the beginning. Now, this double labor turns out to be impossible; the second statistics cannot be determined unless and until the leadership of international Zionism agrees to undertake a census of the world Jewish population, and we have seen that Zionist leaders are not about to accept this idea. As for the first statistics, there is a long series of other difficulties that still present obstacles in spite of all the specific data that the preceding study has produced.

The most insurmountable of these difficulties, and which sums them all up, is the following: if we now know that a minimum of 4,419,908 Jews succeeded in leaving

Europe between 1931 and 1945, we are much less well informed on their nationalities. For countries like Denmark, Norway, Germany, Austria, Bulgaria, and one or two others - the Baltic countries for example, even Greece - there is no problem; they were not on the route of the Jewish migration; the Germans found only national Jews in those countries and everything is clear. But it is not the same in the other countries - Holland, Belgium, France, Italy, Hungary, Rumania - which were countries into which to escape, or to go through, before they became occupied by German troops. There, the Jews were arrested and deported pell-mell, and it is impossible for us to determine accurately the nationalities of those who managed not to get arrested as well as those who were. Hungary is the archetype of this difficulty: there, we did succeed in determining that out of the 800,000 Jews who were living there on March 19, 1944, 543,000 had not been deported; that about 200,000 had been deported; that 57,000 had very probably been massacred in police operations; and that 343,000 had managed to emigrate. But, in each of these categories, it was impossible to determine who was Hungarian, who was Yugoslavian, who was Czechoslovakian, and who was Polish. The same questions hold for Rumania, where we found 147,650 massacred, and 652,350 survivors, 227,350 of whom emigrated. The same questions are found again for Holland, for Belgium, for Luxemburg and for France. In France, we found that only 81,000 Jews of one nationality or the other could have been arrested and deported; we know also that there were no Belgians among them, that the number of French was necessarily between 6,000 and 11,999, and that the number of the Luxemburgers was between 0 and 2,000, the others being Dutch. But these are, all the same, figures which are insufficiently exact to be called statistics. In Poland, we know that 729,040 Jews were arrested, either on their national land or on the emigration route toward the west; but of the 289,300 who tried to emigrate by the Danubian route, how many were arrested in Hungary and how many in Rumania? So many questions for which there are no answers and which can equally be applied to the Czechoslovakians who fled to Hungary and the Yugoslavians who fled to Italy.

In the final analysis, rather than to circulate statistics based on nationalities, every datum of which might have been open to question, and to add to the confusion created by the historians and the statisticians who voice the line of international Zionism, I have preferred to draw up these statistics on the only plane where we are sure of ourselves, that is in Europe. Here, no serious debate is possible: we have affirmed that a minimum of 4,419,908 European Jews managed to emigrate early enough to escape arrest and deportation to concentration camps, and we can add them to those that the historians and statisticians who support the Zionist "genocide" fiction, found living in Europe in 1945.

Here then, on information from the *World Center of Contemporary Jewish Documentation*, are our statistics on the European scale in four sections, with the integration, for 1931, of the 300,000 German Jews and the 180,000 Austrian Jews who are admitted to have left Europe to flee from Hitler together with the million Jews who were in the part of the Russia that was never occupied by the German troops.

Table page 389

Description	1931	1945	Official Losses	Emigrants Traced	Actual (a) Losses
Statist. totals from p. 302	8,297,500	2,288,100	6,009,400	----	----
Known German Emigrants	300,000	300,000	----	----	----
Austrian Emigrants Acknowledged	180,000	180,000	----	----	----
Russian Jews saved by Soviet	1,000,000	1,000,000	----	----	----
Actual totals from WCJD	9,777,500	3,768,100	6,009,400	----	----
Ac. totals as arrived at in this study	9,777,500	3,768,100	—	4,419,908	1,589,492

(a) The figure in this column actually represents the number of European Jews who were not accounted for in the preceding study. Consequently, this figure must be viewed with the following caveats: first this figure represents a *maximum* figure which doubtless would be considerably smaller if a census of the world Jewish population were taken today since whenever a question has arisen pertaining to the propriety of some statistic, it has been resolved in a manner which has favored the proponents of the Zionist line. Second, not every person who is included within this figure can be said to have died at the hands of the Germans. The mere fact that a person is not accounted for does not necessarily mean that he is deceased. These comments also hold true for Mr. Hilberg's statistics which are outlined on the following page

Here again are the same statistics, but this time based on the information of Mr. Raul Hilberg who did not divide Russia into the two zones, but who, too, acknowledged that there were 300,000 German and 180,000 Austrian Jewish emigrants.

Table p. 390

Description	1931	1945	Official Losses	Emigrants Traced	Actual Losses
Totals from p. 302	9,190,000	3,782,500	5,407,000	---	----
Known German Emigrants	300,000	300,000	----	----	----
Austrian Emigrants acknowledged	180,000	180,000	-----	----	----
Totals of Mr. Hilberg for 1945	9,670,000	4,262,500	5,407,500	----	----
totals as arrived at in this study	9,670,000	4,262,500	-----	4,419,908	987,592

On the basis of the preceding analysis, this is where we stand now: First, out of the study of the statistics of *the World Center of Contemporary Jewish Documentation* and from its own data, we find 1,589,492 European Jews dead or missing as a consequence of Nazi persecutions in concentration camps or in some other way. Second, out of the study of Mr. Raul Hilberg's data we find only 987,592 dead or missing Jews.

Twice I took up this problem: first in *Ulysse trahi par les siens*, published in France in 1960, and, second, in an article for the German review *Deutsche Hochschullehrer-Zeitung* (Tubingen, 12, February 1963). Each time that I reviewed the problems, I did it in terms of the data from Jewish sources that had been published at the time. But, the first time, neither the judgment of the Jerusalem Tribunal, nor, more significantly, the study of *The Jewish Communities of the World* of February 1963 had been brought out. And, in terms of what was already known, my conviction had been that the number of Jewish victims of Nazi persecution, in concentration camps or otherwise, should be placed at about 1,000,000, more or less. The second time, I had in my hands the Judgment of the Jerusalem Tribunal, and I had followed day by day the hearings of the Trial, but I still was not acquainted with the study of *the Jewish Communities of the World*, then not yet published. As a conclusion to my writing for the *Deutsche Hochschullehrer-Zeitung* (pp. 61, 62) I had claimed that if the number were greater than 1,000,000 it could not by any means exceed 1,655,300 victims. Today, with all the documents at hand which were lacking then, it can be said that, based on data prior to that of the World Center of Contemporary Jewish Documentation, the number of victims is 1,589,492. On the other hand, the figure is 987,592, based on Mr. Raul Hilberg's data. To achieve greater exactness, we must wait for the new Zionist leaders like Salo Baron, Leon Poliakov, and Michel Borwicz, among others, to give new avowals, or for another trial like the Jerusalem one, to bring us new light on the question. As well as we know these Zionist circles, neither one nor the other of these hypothesis is excluded, but, rather, both are more likely than not to occur. In those

circles, indeed, neither talkers without conscience, seeking cheap publicity, nor, alas, judges looking for vengeance, are lacking. I shall bet a good deal on two other things: the latent and continuous dissensions which exist between Mr. Ben Gurion and Mr. Nahum Goldmann, and the fracas between Khrushchev and Mao Tse-tung.

For a long time now Mr. Nahum Goldmann has been showing signs of fatigue and impatience with the policies of Mr. Ben Gurion with regard to Germany. For example, he had stated publicly that he was not enthusiastic about the arrest of Eichmann and the trial which followed. Through various indiscretions we learn that he does not place much value on all the trials in Germany, aimed at former members of one or another of the Nazi organizations of Hitler's time. In Israel itself, there is a very serious divergence between his group and that of Mr. Ben Gurion, each time the latter finds a German minister stupid enough to accept an invitation sent him with the sole object of having him publicly insulted in Israel by his partisans, and thus of making an issue that attracts the attention of the whole world to the debt which Germany, because she rallied to Hitler in 1933, assumed with regard to Israel. Everything takes place as if, not daring publicly to take a position in opposition to Mr. Ben Gurion with regard to his policy toward Germany, Mr. Nahum Goldmann were trying behind the scenes, to silence him on his main theme. And, the fact that, with regard to the Jews who were exterminated, the statistics which we have from the American partisans of the Zionist line are generally more moderate than those which come from the European branch (as is illustrated by the figures of Mr. Raul Hilberg compared with those of the *World Center of Contemporary Jewish Documentation*) could very well reflect the dissensions between the two men. This would then explain the divergences and contradictions revealed in the Jewish sources in their statistics.

As for the quarrel between Khrushchev and Mao Tse-tung, it could be of consequence in that, along with that of the United States, the Jewish population of Russia is one of the greatest enigmas weighing on the problem. *The Institute of Jewish Affairs* of London and *the Jewish Communities of the World* both told us clearly in 1962 that there were 2.3 million Jews in Russia. But Mr. Raul Hilberg revealed to us that there were 2,600,000 in 1946, and that estimate, which can be considered to be confirmed by the journalist, David Bergelson (in *Die Einheit*, December 5, 1942), can also be considered closer to the truth. In that case, it is not 2.3 million Jews that were in Russia in 1962, but 3,016,000, adjusted for a natural increase at the rate of sixteen per cent. If we take Professor Salo Baron at his word, that figure would be even greater: 3,120,000. But, let us not be tempted. However, we could justify the use of a larger figure, all the less, because in reality there are surely many more than 3,016,000, since the Jewish journalist, David Bergelson, also told us, let us not forget, that eighty per cent of the Baltic Jews, the Poles, and the Rumanians, who found themselves behind the Russian lines as they fled before the German troops in 1941-1942, were saved and sent on their way toward Central Asia by the Soviet authorities. At the end of 1942, Bergelson estimated that there were about 5.2 million Jews on Soviet territory, 3 million of them Russian, and in that he agrees with the statistics of April 17, 1943, of Mr. Richard Korherr, which have already been referred to. Question: what happened to those 2.2 million non-Russian Jews? Answer: some of them managed to escape and reach either the American continent or Israel; the rest of them did not. How many were in each group? We cannot tell. But, we can be sure that as long as Khrushchev and Mao Tse-tung were getting along together it surely was not easy for Jews who had been transported to Central Asia during the war, to make it to the American

continent via China; those who have been able to manage the trip in the postwar period must have managed it clandestinely. The subsequent quarrel between these two grand men of Bolshevism could result in Mao Tse-tung aiding the Jews to leave Soviet territory, just as the China of Chiang Kai-shek aided them before World War II, and for the same reasons. In that case, it could happen that one day a very significant number of Jews might turn up suddenly in all of the countries of the American continent, and perhaps also in Israel. And, unless it is kept hidden in the dark, a new light will be shed on the statistics of world Jewry. Neither is this hypothesis excluded. And, if the United States should adopt a rational policy toward Russia, the truth would come out very fast.

But to return to the problem as it exists in the data that we actually have: we know that the number of European Jews who died as victims of Nazi persecutions is either 1,589,492 persons, established on the basis of data from the *World Center of Contemporary Jewish Documentation* compared with the Exhibits of the Tribunal at Jerusalem and the study, *The Jewish Communities of the World*, which came out in February 1963, or is 987,952 persons, based on the data of Mr. Raul Hilberg compared in the same manner. It still remains to be discovered how the 4,419,908 Jews, who were living in 1945, were divided among the other countries of the world, and who, not being listed as living in the European statistics of Jewish sources, are necessarily thought to have left Europe between 1931 and 1945. That is the problem for the second statistical analysis, which, in my opinion, should present by country the structure of the world Jewish population in 1962. And, as is pointed out in a preceding paragraph, these statistics are impossible to establish at the present time.

We already know one thing which was revealed to us in the study of the Israeli Jewish population, and that is that it includes 1,048,368 European Jews who immigrated to Israel between 1931 and 1962. It remains to be seen how the remaining 3,371,540 European Jews are distributed around the rest of the world.

It is in this latter matter that the Jewish sources are the most secretive. Rarely do we find, for example, in the study of *the Jewish Communities of the World* and in the *World Almanac* of 1963, non-European countries where the admitted Jewish population is greater than it would have been by natural increase based upon the statistics of Mr. Arthur Ruppin for the period of 1926-1928. There are some places where even the natural rate of increase has not been reached; that is the case with the United States, where, if we can believe the aforementioned publications, the population has not risen more than from 4,461,184 in 1936 to 5,500,000 in 1962. However, we have seen that at the natural rate of increase of one per cent there cannot be fewer than 5,550,489 Jews in the United States, and that, at the natural rate of increase, which Mr. Salo Baron gives, there should be 6,170,837. The few countries on continents other than Europe, where the Zionists concede that there is a Jewish population greater than what it would have been by natural increase, based on the Ruppin statistics, are the following: Argentina, Canada, Brazil, and South Africa. For these four countries, these are the statistics that can be drawn up:

Table p. 394

Country	1926 population	Natural increase 36%	1962 Populat. Natural	1962 Populat. conceded	Immigration (b)
Argentina	240,000	86,400	326,000	450,000	123,600
Canada	170,000	61,200	231,200	254,000	22,800
Brazil	40,000	14,400	54,400	140,000	85,600
South Africa	60,000	21,600	87,600	110,000	28,400
TOTAL	510,000	183,600	693,600	954,000 (a)	260,400

(a) The total allows one to admire once again the seriousness of the statistics from Jewish sources. For Argentina, Canada and Brazil, the totals is 844,000. However, there are, in addition, a few Jews in the other countries of the American continent, notably in Mexico, 70,000; in Uruguay, 60,000; in Chile, 15,000, and so on. The total, therefore, for these six countries is 989,000. And for the whole Western Hemisphere, the same statistics give a total of 6.3 million, which the *Jerusalem Post Weekly* (April 19, 1939) brings forward. If, from this total for the two American continents, we subtract these 989,000 persons, there remain for the United States 5,311,000 and not 5.5 million as is claimed by the official statement of the *Institute of Jewish Affairs* of London and the *World Almanac* of 1963 (p. 159). That is what you come to when you want to conceal the actual total of the Jewish population of the United States.

(b) These estimates for immigration include natural increase.

By making an allowance for the natural increase, we get close to 200,000 immigrants of European origin for these four countries, assuming that the figures published in the aforementioned authorities for 1962 are exact, and it would be astonishing if they were. If they are, we still have 3,171,540 European Jews to locate. To do that we would have to be able to draw up figures for all of the countries of the world in the same manner as we did for Argentina, Canada, Brazil, and South Africa. But we cannot, since the latter are the only ones given by the Zionists which concede any immigration.

Still, something must be done, since, if they are not in Europe and not in Israel, these 3,171,540 Jews who were certainly living in 1945 must be somewhere else - together with the additional number that they have accumulated at the natural rate of population expansion. Where? In order to say that with any real certainty we shall have to wait once again for new revelations that the publicity-seeking Zionist movement will not fail one day inadvertently to produce. Until then we can only conjecture, and that is not my method. I shall, therefore, limit myself to stating my basic principles which have defined the direction that my research has taken, and which I continue to pursue.

1. It is not probable, but it is possible - that in August 1945, the date when Mr. Poliakov told us (*Le Troisième Reich et les Juifs*, p. 196) that the European Jewish communities had begun to make an inventory of their losses for Justice Jackson and had come up with only 3,768,100 survivors according to the *World Center of Contemporary Jewish Documentation*, or 4,262,500 according to Mr. Raul Hilberg -

that they gave figures considerably understated for reasons of propaganda. I say it is possible, for two reasons: there was such a chaos of displaced persons in Europe at that time that any serious census was out of the question; and the method used in the Jewish communities, which everywhere counted only Jews of the nationality of the country, might have distorted the results.

2. Even if the result of this Jewish census of 1945 was not out of line (which is not admitted), it is certain that, if all the Jews who had left Europe between 1931 and 1945 had not returned by 1945, many of them came back later, at least to Western Europe, since we can assume that those who returned to the other side of the Iron Curtain were the exceptions. France, in this case, is typical: 300,000 Jews in 1939 and between 450,000 and 500,000 at the end of 1962, with about 130,000 Algerian Jews and about 20,000 Moroccan and Tunisian Jews who came seeking refuge, after the granting of independence to those three countries. 300,000 to 350,000 French Jewish nationals is a normal figure in relation to the entire French population in 1962. But the statistics of the *World Center of Contemporary Jewish Documentation* continue to claim 180,000 in 1945 plus the natural increase rate of 16 per cent, or 208,000 (216,000 if we use the natural increase rate of Mr. Salo Baron). It is very probable that if one went to the trouble, one could make similar statements for Belgium (where, in addition, 20,000 to 25,000 Jews returned from the Congo), Holland, Austria, and perhaps even Germany. However, all of the Jews who returned to Europe after the month of August 1945, whose number we cannot know exactly as long as the Zionists refuse to give it to us, since official census-taking will "bring down the wrath of God," surely must amount to several hundreds of thousands and must belong with those 3,171,540 which no Jewish source allocates to any place.

3. The problem of the Polish, Baltic and Rumanian Jews, who in the years 1941-1942 were evacuated to Central Asia and who, if one can believe the Jewish journalist, David Bergelson, should have numbered between 2 and 2.2 million in 1942, since there were 3 million Jews in Russian in 1939, and at the end of 1942, there were about 5.2 million. How many of these Jews are still living in "Central Asia" (read, Siberia) with their offspring? How many have succeeded in escaping in the past 16 years? Where have they gone? Everything points to the fact that those who managed to escape secretly from the U.S.S.R. reached the American continent, which was for them the easiest to get to. Concerning that supposition, a hypothesis, for what it is worth, and which I do not offer as a certainty, runs through my mind: in 16 years, it is possible that half of them, at a cost of immeasurable difficulties, managed to leave Central Asia for the American continent. If that is so, and since the Zionist demographers have not located them in Canada, Brazil, or in any other country in the Western Hemisphere, they must be in the United States. Thus, the following statistics could be drawn up for Russia and the United States:

A. Russia

1. Jews found still living by Mr. Raul Hilberg in 1945: 2,600,000
2. Jews still living in Central Asia, according to Mr. David Bergelson: 2,200,000
3. Total Jewish population in Russia in 1945: 4,800,000

4. Jews who succeeded in leaving Central Asia for the United States: 1,100,000
5. Jews who were left in Russia: 3,700,000
6. Jewish natural increase of 16% since 1947: 592,000
7. Total Jewish population in Russia in 1962: 4,292,000

B. United States

1. Jewish population for 1926 (official figure): 4,081,242
2. Jewish natural increase of 36% since 1926: 1,469,247
3. Total Jewish population in 1962: 5,550,489
4. Jewish immigrants from Central Asia since 1946: 1,100,000
5. Their natural increase of 16% since 1946: 176,000
6. Total Jewish population from Asia together with progeny: 1,276,000
7. Total Jewish population in the United States in 1962: 6,826,489

But, this total of 6,826,489 includes only immigration from Central Asia, and, therefore, it excludes all of those who, like Mme. Hannah Arendt and Mr. Robert W. Kempner, came to the United States by some other route from Europe. We can surely say that they number more than two, but, how many we do not know, or, at least, not yet. All that can be said is that they are there and that surely the Jewish population of the United States is greater than 6,826,489 persons. It can also be stated that the claim of the *National Observer* (July 2, 1962) that there were 12,000,000 Jews in the United States in 1962 may be an exaggeration toward the other extreme, but, I would not be astonished if one day soon a Zionist leader inadvertently reveals that there were about 8 million Jews in the United States. The estimate of 12,000,000 in the United States has been repeated several times with an attempt at numerical documentation by the *Economic Council Letter* published in New York City.

I repeat that the preceding analysis is only conjectural and is not a fact; it is, however, the hypothesis that is necessary to every work as a basis from which to conduct further research; it is the hypothesis which orients mine. To my mind, it is plausible and it expresses, all the better, my profound conviction which, until now, has not led me to any impasse or error and which has made it possible for me to state some ten years ago the conclusions that were to be drawn later from the Jerusalem Trial and the study of the *Jewish Communities of the World*.

The actual Jewish population of the world in 1962 is very close to being the following, at least in the order of magnitude of the figures. By using statistics for each country of the world dated for 1926, or 1927, or 1928, as the case was, Mr. Arthur Ruppin estimated that world Jewry had reached a total of 15,800,000 persons as of that date. We have seen that the *World Almanac* of 1951 estimated the world Jewish

population at 16,643,120 for 1939. The natural rate of increase having considerably dropped between 1926 and 1939 (Poliakov dixit, cf p. 295), but when it is compared with that of Mr. Arthur Ruppin, this estimate is allowable. Here, then is the Jewish population of the world in 1962, calculated on the corrected data of the *World Center of Contemporary Jewish Documentation*.

1. World Jewish population in 1939: 16,643,120
2. Jewish victims of Nazism: 1,589,492
3. World Jewish population living in 1945(1): 15,053,628
4. Jewish natural increase of 16% since 1946: 2,408,580
5. Total Jewish population on 1962(2): 17,552,208

And here is the same as calculated on the corrected data of Mr. Raul Hilberg:

1. World Jewish population in 1939: 16,643,120
2. Jewish victims of Nazism: 987,592
3. World Jewish population living in 1946: 15,655,528
4. Jewish increase of 16% since 1946: 2,504,884
5. Total Jewish population in 1962: 18,160,412

And, here we are at the end of this study. It remains for me only to make an apology to the reader: this study has clearly been very long, and difficult to follow, like all that is technical by nature. But a demographic study can only be of such a technical nature. What the reader must recognize is that, until now, the proponents of the Zionist line -- whose "official" contentions on the horrors of the war I have been following -- have never been faced with arguments other than those from journalists, which have been often vague and specious, factors that have been the main reason for their lack of success. The only way to shatter their arguments was to set up against them the arguments of a specialist. And, that is what I have tried to do.

FOOTNOTES

1. Between 15 and 18 million in 1947," as Hanson W. Baldwin has said (cf p. 294 above).
2. It must not be forgotten that this total comes out of the study of Jewish sources, that is, those which have been published under the sanction of the Zionist movement or by the Rabbinate, after investigation of the synagogues. But, if it is true, as claimed by Arthur Koestler (*A l'ombre du Dinosaur*), that not more than two-thirds of the

world's Jews are registered in the synagogues, then there is room to wonder if this figure should not be augmented in the same proportion.

Annexes

Appendix A: Four Descriptions of Prison Life in French Penal Institutions

The following are four descriptions of prison life in penal institutions which were operated by the French government at about the same time that Buchenwald and other German concentration camps were functioning.

Discipline in the Maison Centrale in Riom in 1939

"Three notable elements must be remembered about disciplinary methods.

"The first is the institution of an internal hierarchy of prisoners who cooperate with the wardens in maintaining proper order. I have often heard the French become indignant over this institution in the Nazi prisons, over these gratuitous assistants to the gang wardens; they are the same persons who cannot admit that the Germans were ignorant of what was going on in their country, and yet who do not know what is happening in France. For the *Kapos*, the *Schreibers*, the *Vorarbeiters*, the *Stubendienst*, etc. . . there are however, precedents. The workshop bookkeepers, the foremen (although there were civilians too), the entire administration are made up of prisoners, and obviously enjoy certain advantages. Quite apart from this are the provosts explicitly in charge of keeping order. That goes for the dormitory provost, who has next to his bed an alarm button to alert the wardens in case that something abnormal occurs (smoke, reading, conversations, etc....) and which, happily, is little used. However, its use is up to the official executioner, the provost of the Ward.

"Now I must say what a Strong-Ward is: the special prison within the prison, and in fact a torture chamber (I can attest that the word is not an exaggeration). This second element of discipline, like Dante's Hell, includes various circles. It begins in the discipline room, where-in principle-the convicts are marched around in a circle with very short pauses, at a pace maintained by giving a special ration to the pace-setter. while smaller rations are given to the others: the fact is that blows rain down. I was lucky enough to escape this myself, but I can attest to having often seen the poor beggars coming back from the 'room' with obvious signs of recent blows. Then, there was solitary confinement - in principle - up to 90 consecutive days, practically equivalent to a death sentence, with a tin of soup every four days. Finally, there were some refinements of cruelty which are particularly repugnant. In particular was the torture called the 'shirt,' a straight-jacket that tied the arms together behind one's back; very often, then, the arms were brought up as far as the neck. I attest, after having collected numberless testimonies all in agreement, that some wardens struck the men

with various instruments, including the poker, until death resulted. I attest that the Nazis only added some details in perfecting the art of slowly killing men.

"Now, and this is the third instrument of discipline, these 'accessory' sentences, which sometimes meant a death sentence, were not pronounced by tribunals established by law, but by a jurisdiction which to my knowledge was ignorant of the law, the *Pretoire*. It is a tribunal within the prison presided over by the director, assisted by a sub-director (in penitentiary slang, the 'under-pimp') with the head warden acting as clerk. At the *Pretoire*, there is no pleading, no defense, no intelligible indictment, and no reply except for the ritual " *Merci, Monsieur le Directeur* ," following the sentence. I was always able to get off with a simple fine, which meant only cutting down my right to buy things in the canteen: income was limited to salary, since help from the outside was very much reduced; in those days, no package was allowed to be received by a prisoner except for underwear. But heavy sentences were constantly handed down even for a simple non-fulfillment of a job." (Pierre Bernard. *Revolution proletarienne* , June 1949.)

In the Prisons of the "Liberation"

"All the French wanted this," say our 'patriots.'

"Edouard Gentez, printer at Courbevoie, sentenced in July 46, not as a criminal, but as a printer, was transferred from Fresnes to Fontevault in September 46. As a result of beatings, privations and cold, he contracted pleurisy, which caused him to be struck from the list to be transferred to Fontevault.

"An hour before the departure, the condemned of the S.P.A.C. who were on this list were struck off on an order; they were still needed. They were replaced, and Gentez was among those newly inscribed.

"He arrived at the *Centrale* , two and a half hours standing, in the sun, then eight days shut up in a hole called the ' mitard ' ; after this, Gentez was admitted to the infirmary, ruled over by a butcher assassin, Ange Soleil, a mulatto who had cut to pieces and walled up his mistress, which prepared him for the functions of prison provost-nurse-doctor, far more powerful than the young civilian doctor, a dandy named Gaultier or Gautier

"Soleil admitted those sick men into the infirmary who shared with him two thirds of their parcels, and rejected those whose parcels were too small, by a very clear and simple system.

"Gentez, having neither parcel nor funds, could not pay, and in spite of the seriousness of his sickness, was put into the ' innocupes ,' those forced to three quarters of an hour fast march, one quarter of an hour rest, from morning to night, every day, Sundays included

. "Gentez, who was too weak, was let off that torture, but for all that was not permitted to lie down or even to sit down; he had to remain standing, without moving, hands behind his back, without coat, during the marching.

"The cold aggravated his pleurisy and Gentez went each week to the medical office where he was given aspirin, cod liver oil, and where cupping glasses were applied to him, but he was never admitted to the infirmary.

"He groaned without stopping all night long. The two prisoner doctors, the surgeon Perribert and Doctor Lejeune, sounded his chest Saturday morning, and discovered double bronchial pneumonia .

"When Gentez fell down in the yard, the nurse who was called, went to find Ange Soleil, who began to shout, called him a faker, and had him thrown in a dungeon, along with Doctor Perribert, who was guilty of having made the examination without authorization.

"Gentez was stripped naked and thrown into the cell, where the temperature was five degrees above zero (-15° C.) He knocked all night for help, but no one came. The next morning, January 14, 1947, he was found dead.

"Finally, he was carried to the infirmary, where he was pronounced dead there, of a heart attack. He was buried simply under a number, 3479.

"But there was an embarrassing witness, Gentez' son whom I knew in prison and next to whom I lived out the vicissitudes of this stark drama. He obtained an investigation. This was properly conducted. Ange Soleil was transferred to Fresnes, but was set free by a procedure of amnesty [sic]. The Directors Dujour, Vessieres and Guillonet were removed.

"Andre Marie had promised to reduce Gentez' son's sentence to three years, as a result of this tragic business. Since then more than three years have gone by, and, if I am well informed, he is still in prison." Signed: Benoit C....

"This is an extract of a letter sent to me from X prison . . . somewhere in France. (My discretion is due to the fact that I do not want to expose the author to the legal process mentioned in the above document.)

"Benoit C. . . has not read *Valsez* , *saucisses* which he is not acquainted with, but *Vertiges* .

"He informed me about the percentage (10%) of social workers gabbling around -not at all to reproach them for it-and describes without too much complaint the curious ways of certain ' *messieurs de l'oeuvre de Saint-Vincent-de Paul* ' [gentlemen of the Society of . . .] with fingers heavy with signet rings.

"This testimony is all the more conclusive, as it comes from someone obsessed with sex and not at all with politics." (Communication from Albert. Paraz.)

At Poissy

"In February 1946, head shaved, in clogs and coarse cloth, Henri Beraud found himself in Workshop 14 on the second floor of the jail at Poissy. Under the eye of an overseer whose duty it was to enforce 'the rule of silence', a rule that weighed on the

prison night and day, he made tags with cord or twist wire, averaging .95 francs per thousand.

"Typical prison stupidity: the table chief was a burglar who had under him, besides Beraud, General Linsard. a colonel, two Justices, an advocate general, the editor-in-chief of the *Journal de Rouen* , a university professor, and some Paris journalists.

"In his book., *Je sors du bagne* ,one of his prison companions at Poissy, as on Re island, brought out how much the convict Beraud earned during the month of April 1945: labor, 15 Fr. Deduction for the prison administration, 12 Fr. left, 3 Fr. Set aside. 1.50 Fr. left for the prisoner, 1.50 12 Fr.

"And this was for work for more than seven hours a day. "(*La Bataille*, September 21, 1949.)

German Prisoners in France

"La Rochelle, October 18.,1948. Informed of the scandalous acts of which former officer Max-Georges Roux, 36, assistant to the commanding officer of the German prison camp at Chatellaillon-Plage was guilty, the examining magistrate of La Rochelle referred the matter to the military tribunal at Bordeaux where Roux had been transferred. The ex-officer was then serving an 18 months prison sentence which had been given him the preceding August at La Rochelle for breach of trust and for swindling various associations(1).

"Infinitely more serious were the crimes committed by Roux in the prisoner-of-war camp. It was a matter of real crimes, and so great that it seems difficult to believe that Roux could be the only one found guilty before the judges. At Chatellaillon this base person had, among other things, made several [P.O.W] strip and had beaten them with a leaded whip. Two of the unfortunates had died during these sessions with the knout. "One overwhelming testimony was that of the German doctor Clauss Steen, who was interned at Chatellaillon. Interrogated at Kiel, where he lives, Mr. Steen stated that from May to September 1945, he had verified at the [P.O.W.] camp the deaths of fifty of his compatriots. Their deaths had been brought about by insufficient food, heavy labor, and by the perpetual fear they lived in of being tortured.

"The food given out in the camp, which was under the orders of the commanding officer Texier, consisted, in actual fact of a plate of clear soup with a little bread. The rest of the rations disappeared in the black market. There was one period when the number of those with dysentery amounted to 80 per cent.

"Texier and Roux, with their subordinates, proceeded, besides that, to loot their prisoners, taking away from them everything of value. The thievery of these gangsters with military braid, was estimated at one hundred million; they had so well organized their business that bank notes and jewelry were sent directly to Belgium by automobile.

"Let us hope that with Roux the other guilty persons will soon be incarcerated in the fortress of Ha, and that an exemplary punishment will be meted out to these real war criminals." (in the newspapers , October 19, 1948.)

FOOTNOTES

(1) At present this Roux holds a high administrative office in the southeast of France.
As a reward for his fine deeds no doubt!

Appendix B:

The Two French Versions of the Gerstein Document

The following is the French version of the Gerstein Document as presented by L. Poliakov in 1951 (*Bréviaire de la Haine*, pp. 220-24), with this comment: "This account was written down as is, in a halting French; the style has, in essence, been respected." And eleven years later in his book the *Procès de Jerusalem*, Mr. Poliakov presents it again in the form of Exhibit No. 124 of the Judgment, with this comment: "This document was written down by Gerstein directly in French. We present it here just as is." These two versions are reproduced on the following pages in parallel columns, with the first printed on the left side, and with the second printed on the right side, so that the reader may see for himself to what extent Mr. Poliakov merely "in essence, respected the style." What is one to think of a document which, after an interval of eleven years, can be presented in two such contradictory versions? It will be noticed that the Jerusalem Tribunal retained neither the daily extermination figures of the camps cited, nor the visit of Hitler to Belzec. And, what is one to think of a man like Mr. Poliakov who, after an interval of eleven years, presents these two versions of the same text?

From this same Mr. Poliakov we have a third version of the Gerstein Documents in *Le Troisième Reich et les Juifs* (1955, pp. 107-119) and a fourth version in *La Terre Retrouvée* (April 1, 1964). These third and fourth versions include whole paragraphs which do not occur in one or the other of the first two. Moreover, they include material which is contradictory on many points, when compared with the former. And, like the former, they both bear the assurance that they were "reproduced as is," but with an additional notation. "From the German historical review, *Viertel-Jahreshefte für Zeitgeschichte*, no. 2, April 1953." There is no doubt that at this rate Mr. Poliakov could soon be the impresario of a multitude of "Gerstein Documents," all different and all contradictory, but somehow all authentic. Incidentally, not one of these versions mentions the estimates which appear in the original in which the number of European Jewish victims "reaches 25 million."

Lastly, to conclude this discussion of the proliferation of Gerstein documents, I want to mention that a small volume has just come out in German with the title *Kurt Gerstein* (E.V.Z. Verlag, Zurich) and with the signature of a certain Helmut Franz, who was, he says, an intimate friend of Gerstein. Mr. Franz gives us a second German version of the Document that is very different from the one offered by Hans Rothfels

So that none of these alarming manipulations lose any of their flavor, there might be some interest in giving a little free publicity to the latest news which has reached us concerning this famous "Document:" in offering his fourth version in the French tongue in *La Terre Retrouvée*, Mr. Poliakov informs us that his original version (which of the four?) "has disappeared from the central depository of the archives of

the French military court," and also that "the dossier of the proceedings begun against the man in 1949 by the *Spruchkammer* of Tübingen" was gone. Since these "two essential items" - and how essential! - "were lacking," he says that he was "prevented - from undertaking a serious study." It is remarkable that he is aware of this after having given three versions already and that this fact does not prevent him from giving the fourth.

We are forced to conclude that no one will ever be able to consult this document removed forever in this way from the scrutiny of historians. So I ask this question: in whose interest was it that this document should disappear? I propose to make an inquiry into this disappearance which is a criminal outrage to historical truth.

The Gerstein Document

First French version attributed to Gerstein by Poliakov in 1951, in *Bréviaire de la Haine*.

A. Poliakov's Introduction:

The victims are no longer here to give testimony before the world; their executioners, too, have disappeared, or gone underground. Among the rare testimonies which have come down to us on the functioning of the camps, here is one from the tragic hero of the German Resistance, the chemical engineer Kurt Gerstein. His account was written down directly in halting French and we have in essence kept his style.

B. Text of the Document:

... in January 1942 I was made chief of the technical disinfection services of the *Waffen-S.S.*, including also an extremely toxic gas section.

In this capacity I was visited on June 8, 1942, by S.S. *Sturmabführer* Gunther of the R.S.H.A., in civilian clothes. He was unknown. He ordered me to get for him immediately, for an ultra secret mission, 100 Kg of Prussic acid, and to bring them to a place known only to the driver of the truck

A few weeks later, we left for Prague. I could more or less guess what purpose the Prussic acid was to serve, and what kind of an order this was, but I accepted because it gave me the chance I had long been waiting for to get to the bottom of all these things. Moreover, as an expert on Prussic acid, I had such authority and jurisdiction that it was easy for me to state under some pretext or other that the Prussic acid was not usable, decomposed or something like that, and thus to prevent its being used for extermination. We took with us, pretty much by chance, Professor Doctor of Medicine Pfannenstiel, S.S.-*Obersturmbannführer*, holder of the chair of Hygiene at the University of Marburg-on-the-Lahn.

Second French version attributed to Gerstein by the Jerusalem Tribunal in 1961, offered to the public by Poliakov in *Procès de Jerusalem*.

A. Tribunal's Introduction:

Exhibit 124. Here now we have a description from the pen of a German of the extermination method at the camp at Belzec, which very much resembled the one at Treblinka. The author is an officer of the S.S. by the name of Gerstein, whose conscience gave him no peace, and who, after 1942, tried to unveil to the world what was going on in the extermination camps.

Immediately after the war he drafted the document which we are about to cite, and handed it over to allied officers. Later we will return to Gerstein's comments about that. For the moment we will only say that the statements of Gerstein are supported on all points by the depositions we have heard, so that the proofs are mutually backed up. We consider that the description given by Gerstein is a description of what he actually saw. Here is what he wrote (T/ 13 09 (1)):

(N.B. This document was drafted by Gerstein directly into French. We offer it as is.)

B. Text of the Document:

[That part of the document that appears on the page at the left is omitted by the Jerusalem Tribunal.] (Left page)

Then we left with the truck for Lublin (Poland). *SS-Gruppenführer* Globocnik was waiting for us there. At the factory at Collin, I purposely let it be understood that the acid was to be used to kill human beings. In the afternoon a man showed a great deal of interest in our truck. He went off in a great hurry when he saw he was observed. Globocnik told us: "This is one of the most secret of all secrets there are, even the most secret. Anyone speaking about it will be shot at once. Just yesterday, two gabbers were shot." Then he explained to us:

"Actually (it was the 17th of August 1942) there are three installations in existence: 1) Belzec, on the Lublin-Lwow road. Maximum per day, I 5,000 persons. 2) Sobibor, I do not know exactly where it is, 20,000 persons a day. 3) Treblinka, 120 Kilometers NNE of Warsaw. 4) Majdanek, near Lublin (in preparation)."

Globocnik said, "You will have to disinfect a very large quantity of clothing coming from Jews, Poles, Czechs, etc. Your other duty will be to improve the working of our gas chambers, functioning on the exhaust of a Diesel motor. A more toxic gas is needed, and one that works faster, such as Prussic acid. The *Fuehrer* and Himmler - they were here the day before yesterday, August 15th - ordered me to go myself with all those who are to see the installation."

Professor Pfannenstiel asked him. "But what does the *Fuehrer* say?" Globocnik answered. "The *Fuehrer* orders that all operations be accelerated. Dr. Herbert Linden who was here yesterday asked me, 'But wouldn't it be more prudent to burn the bodies instead of burying them? Another generation might judge these things in a different way.'

"I answered, 'Gentlemen, if ever after us there is a generation so cowardly, so soft that it cannot understand our so good and so necessary work, all of National Socialism

will have been in vain. On the contrary bronze tablets should be buried stating that it was us, we, who have the courage to carry out this gigantic work.' Then the Fuehrer said, 'Yes, my good Globocnik, you are right.'

(Right page is blank) [That part of the document that appears on the page at the left is omitted by the Jerusalem Tribunal]

(Left page) The next day we left for Belzec. Globocnik introduced me to SS (1) ... who showed me the installations. That day we did not see any dead, but a pestilential smell pervaded the whole region. Next to the station there was a large barracks "wardrobe" with an office-window "valuables." Farther on a hall with about a hundred chairs, "hair-dresser." Then a corridor 150 meters long in the open air, with barbed wire on both sides and with a sign "To the baths and inhalations." In front of us a house of the bath establishment type; on the right and on the left large concrete basins with geraniums and other flowers. On the roof the star of David. And on the building the inscription "Heckenholt Foundation."

The next day, a little before 7 o'clock, they announced to me: "In ten minutes the first train will arrive!" Indeed, a few minutes later a train did arrive from Lemberg: 45 cars with more than 6,000 persons. Two hundred Ukrainians detailed for this service, tore off the doors and with leather riding whips chased the Jews out of the carriages. A loud-speaker was giving instructions: Take all clothing off, even artificial limbs and spectacles. Turn all valuables and money in to the window marked "Valuables." Women and girls are to have their hair cut in the "Hair-dresser" barracks. (An *Untersturmführer*-S.S. told me, "It's to make something special for submariners.")

(Right page) The other day we left for Belzec. A small special station with two platforms sloping up the hill of yellow sand immediately to the north of the road and the railway. To the south, near the roadway, with a few service houses with the sign "Service area Belzec of the S.S. army." Globocnik introduced me to S.S.-*Hauptsturmführer* Obermeyer of Pirmasens, who showed me the installations with great *retenance*. That day no dead were seen, but the smell of the whole region, also of the highroad, was pestilential. Next to the little station there was a large barracks "Wardrobe" with a window "Valuables." Then a room with 100 chairs "Hair-dresser," then a corridor 150 meters long in the open air, barbed wire on both sides and with a sign "To the baths and inhalations!"

In front of us a house like a bathing institution; to the right and left, big concrete tubs with geranium or other flowers. After having gone up a small stairway, to the right and to the left, three and three rooms, like garages, 4 x 5 meters, 1.90 m. high. Going back, but not visible, wooden openings. On the roof, the star of David in copper. In front of the building the inscription "Heckenholt Foundation."

More - that afternoon - I did not see

. Other morning, a few minutes before 7 o'clock, I was told, "After ten minutes, the train will arrive!"

Truly after a few minutes the first train arrived from Lemberg, 45 cars with 6,700 persons, 1,450 already dead on arrival. Behind the little sky-lights with barbed wire over, children, youngsters, full of fear, women, men.

The train arrived: 200 Ukrainians, coerced to this service, tore off the doors and with leather riding whips chased the people out of the cars. Then a big loud speaker gave instructions: "In the open, some in the barracks, take off all clothing, also artificial limbs and spectacles. With little piece of string, offered by a little Jewish boy 4 years old, tie the shoes together. Turn in all valuables, all money to window." Valuables without voucher or receipt. Then the women and the young women to the hair-dresser - to have cut, one or two cuts, the hair which disappears into large potato sacks "to make something special of it for submarines, padding etc. . . ." the S.S.-*Unterscharführer* of the service told me. (Left page)

Then the march began. On the right and left the barracks, behind, two dozen Ukrainians, guns in hand. They approach. Myself and Wirth, we find ourselves in front of the death chambers. Completely naked, the men and women, babies, the mutilated, they go by. In the corner, a big S.S. with a loud pastoral voice says to the wretched people, "Nothing terrible will happen to you! Just breathe very deeply, it strengthens the lungs, it is a way of preventing the spread of contagious diseases, it's a good disinfectant!" They asked him what their fate was to be. He told them, "The men are to work, build houses and lay streets. The women will not be made to; they will be occupied with housekeeping and in the kitchen." It was for some of these poor people a last little hope, enough to make them march without resistance toward the death chambers. Most of them know everything, the smell gives it away! They go up a small wooden stairway and go into the death chambers, most not saying anything, pushed by the others coming behind them. A Jewess of about 40 years with eyes like torches, curses the murderers; getting a few blows of the whip from Captain Wirth himself, she disappeared into the gas chamber. Many say their prayers, others ask, "Who will give us water for death?" (Israelite rite.) Into the chambers the S.S. shove the men, "Fill up" Wirth has ordered, 700-800 in 93 sq. m. The doors are closed. At this moment I understand the reason for the sign "Heckenholt." Heckenholt is the driver of the Diesel, whose exhaust is to kill the unfortunates. S.S. *Unterscharführer* Heckenholt tries to get the motor started. But it doesn't go! Captain Wirth arrives. It is noticeable that he is afraid because I am present at this disaster. Yes, I see everything and I wait. My stop watch clocked everything, 50 minutes, 70 minutes, the Diesel doesn't go!

(Right page) Then the march began: to the right and left barbed wire, behind two dozen Ukrainians with whips. Led by a young girl, extraordinarily beautiful they came on. Myself with Captain Wirth, Police, we found ourselves in front of the death chambers. Completely naked, men, women, young girls, children, babies, those with only one leg, all naked went by. In the corner a husky S.S. who, in a loud, pastoral voice, said to the poor things: "Nothing will happen to you except that you must breathe deeply, it makes the lungs strong, this inhalation, it is necessary to counter contagious diseases, it is a very good disinfectant!" When he was asked what was to become of them, he said to them, "Truly the men are to work making roads and houses. But the women do not have to. Only, if they want to, they can help with the housekeeping or in the kitchen." For some of those poor people a little hope once more, enough to make them march without resistance to the death chambers, most of

them know everything, the smell indicates what their lot will be! Then they go up the little stairway and - seeing the truth! Mothers, nursing, babies at the breast, naked, many children of all ages - naked - they hesitate, but they go into the death chambers, most of them without saying a word, pushed by those behind them who are hustled by the whips of the S.S.

A Jewish woman, about 40 years old, with eyes like torches, calls the blood of their children down on their murderers. Getting five blows of the whip on the face from Police Captain Wirth himself she disappeared into the gas chamber. Many say their prayers, others say, "Who will give us the, death water?" (Israelite rite.) Into the rooms the S.S. push the men. "Fill up good," Captain Wirth has ordered. The naked men are standing on the feet of the others. 700-800 in 25 square meters (2) and 45 cubic meters! The doors close. Meanwhile the rest of the train, naked, are waiting. I am told, "Also in winter naked," "But they might die!" "That's what they are here for," was the answer. Then I understood what "Foundation Heckenholt" meant. Heckenholt is the driver of the Diesel "the exhaust of which is destined to kill the poor people!" S.S. *Unterscharführer* goes to some trouble to get the Diesel motor running. But it doesn't start. Captain Wirth arrives. I can see that he is afraid because I am observing this disaster. Yes, I see everything, and I wait. My stop watch has fixed everything. 50 minutes, 70 minutes, the Diesel engine does not go!

(Left page) The men are waiting in the gas chambers. In vain. They are heard crying "like in the synagogue" says Professor Pfannenstiel, his eye to a window fitted into the wooden door. Captain Wirth, furious, gives a few lashes of the whip to the Ukrainian who is Heckenholt's helper. After two hours and 49 minutes the watch recorded everything - the Diesel begins to run. 25 minutes go by. Many are already dead, that can be seen through the little window, since an electric lamp lights up the interior from time to time.

After 32 minutes, finally, all are dead! On the other side, Jewish workers open the wooden doors. They have been promised -- for their awful work -- their lives, as well as a small per cent of the valuables and money found. Like pillars of basalt, the men are still standing, there not being the smallest space for falling or leaning. Even in death can be seen families holding hands. It is difficult to separate them, as they empty the rooms for the next load. They throw out the bodies, blue, damp with sweat and urine, legs covered with fecal matter and menstrual blood. Two dozen workers are busy going through the mouths, opening them with iron hooks, "Gold on the left, not on the right!" Others examine the anus and genital organs looking for money, diamonds, gold, etc. . . Dentists take out with the help of hammers, gold teeth, bridges, crowns. In the midst of them stands Captain Wirth. He is in his element, and, showing me a large can full of teeth, he says, "Look for yourself at the amount of gold! Just from yesterday and day before yesterday! You can't imagine what we find every day, dollars, diamonds, gold! You'll see yourself!" He leads me to a jeweler, responsible for all these valuables. They show me one of the heads of the great Berlin store "Kaufhaus des Westens," and a little man to whom violin music was being played, the heads of the gangs of Jewish workers. "He is a Captain of the Imperial Austrian Army, Chevalier of the German Iron Cross!"

Wirth tells me. Then the bodies were thrown into great ditches about 100 x 20 x 10 meters in size, situated near the gas chambers. After a few days the bodies began to

swell up and the whole thing raised up about 2 to 3 meters because of the gas forming in the corpses. After a few days, when the swelling was over, the bodies sank down. Then, I was told, on the tracks of the railway the bodies were burned with the use of Diesel oil, so as to make them disappear

(Right page) The men wait in their gas chamber. In vain. We listen to them crying "like in the synagogue" says *S.S.-Sturmbannführer* Professor Dr. Pfannenstiel, ordinarius of Hygiene at the University of Marburg-Lahn, with his ear to the wooden door. Captain Wirth, furious, gives 11 to 12 lashes of the whip across the face of the Ukrainian, who is assistant to Heckenholt. After two hours, 49 minutes -- the stop watch has recorded everything -- the Diesel starts. Until this moment the men in the four chambers already full are living, living four times 750 persons in four times 45 cubic meters! Again 25 minutes go by. Many, it is true, are dead. That is what can be seen through the little window, through which an electric lamp lights up for a minute the inside of the room. After 28 minutes, still a few alive. After 32 minutes, finally, all are dead! From the other side, Jewish workers open the wooden doors. They have been promised - for their awful labor - their liberty and a few percentages of whatever the value of the valuables and money found. Like pillars of bassalt the dead are still standing, there not being the smallest space to fall or to lean. Even dead, one recognized families with their hands still clasped. It was difficult to separate them, in order to empty the rooms for the next load.

C. Poliakov's Conclusion:

There is much to add to this description, valid for Treblinka or Sobibor as well as for the camp at Belzec. The installations were conceived more or less in the same manner, and carbon monoxide, produced with a Diesel motor, was the method used for administering death. At Majdanek, which was created later and which lasted until the last days of the German occupation, the method of asphyxiation with Prussic acid (Zyklon B) was introduced, as it was in Auschwitz; we have pointed out, on the other hand, that Majdanek was not a camp for immediate extermination.

The researchers of the Polish War Crimes Commission have established that the total number of victims was close to 600,000 at Belzec, 250,000 at Sobibor, more than 700,000 at Treblinka, and 300,000 at Chelmno (300). They were more than 90% Polish Jews; but there was no European nationality not represented in the remaining 8 to 10%. In particular, out of the 110,000 Jews deported from the Netherlands, at least 34,000 were exterminated at Sobibor (301).

After nine months of intensive activity, the Belzec camp stopped functioning in December 1942. In the fall of 1943, once the "final solution" was for all practical purposes achieved in Poland, Sobibor and Treblinka were also closed down, and as many traces of them as possible were effaced, buildings torn down or destroyed, and the grounds carefully re-wooded. Alone, the camp at Chelmno, the first in place, kept on operating without interruption until the month of October 1944, and was not completely eliminated until January 1945.

C. Conclusion of the Jerusalem Tribunal

It is evident from the report of the Polish commission enquiring into Belzec (T. 1316) that this camp served above all for the extermination of Jews from southeast Poland; but Jews from Czechoslovakia, Austria, Rumania, Hungary and Germany were also killed there. The Commission estimated at 600,000 at least the number of people who met death there.

125. Testimonies given on Sobibor camp have given us a picture similar to that of Treblinka and Belzec camps. The Jews who were exterminated there came from Poland and the territories which the Germans occupied in Soviet Russia as well as Czechoslovakia, Slovakia, Austria and Germany. This camp was destroyed following a revolt of the Jewish prisoners which broke out there in October 1943. According to the estimates of the Polish Commission, 250,000 persons at least perished there.

126. Majdanek camp, a large concentration camp near Lublin, likewise served as an extermination center for Jews. They were killed there by shooting and by gas. Witness Joseph Reznik described to us (Session 64) a massacre of Jews by shooting that took place in November in "Field No. 5 of Majdanek." In the report of the Polish Commission is found the number of victims who were killed in the open in a single day, November 3, 1943: 18,000 Jews. Gas chambers were also installed at Majdanek. Jews were deported to this camp from Poland, Slovakia, Czechoslovakia, and western and southern Europe. The Commission estimated that 200,000 Jews perished there. Majdanek camp had branch camps, such as Travniki, which has already been mentioned as the destination for Jews from Germany.

Author's Postscript

The manuscript of this work was being printed when the shocking business of the *Vicaire* hit Paris. In the newspaper, *Le Monde*, which supported the play, I wrote that the Gerstein Document was an historical forgery, so false that the Nuremberg Tribunal itself had ruled it out as not proof of evidence, on January 30, 1946. *Le Monde* (December 26, 1963) published the information I gave them, with the following editorial comment:

"It is true that during the Nuremberg Trial the President set aside this part of the proof brought by the French Prosecution. Taken from the documents of the American delegation, it had not yet been authenticated under oath. This took place January 30, 1946, during the morning session. When the proceedings were resumed in the afternoon, the British Attorney General Sir Maxwell-Fyfe, explained that this report as well as all those of series PS had been authenticated by American officers. The Court then decided to take it in consideration."

I wrote again to *Le Monde* to point out to them that "authenticated by American officers" and "taken in consideration" did not mean "retained for the prosecution." I pointed out:

1. That during the afternoon session in question what had above all been decided (Report of the Hearings, p. 377) by common consent of the President of the Tribunal and Mr. DuBost was that Document P.S. 1553 was composed solely of 12 invoices

for Zyklon B and that the Gerstein statement was not part of it. The Gerstein statement had only been introduced as a foundational reference to the aforementioned invoices: "To document P.S. 1553 [sic] attached the deposition of Gerstein and the explanations of the American chief of service who obtained this document..."

2. That all the P.S. documents "authenticated by American officers" had not necessarily been authenticated by the Tribunal - far from it! - and had not all been retained for the prosecution. All of those documents that had been authenticated and retained for use as evidence appeared either in one of the books reporting the hearings or in the list (Volume 24) of the documents retained, and in one or the other of the 18 volumes of documents, which was not the case with the Gerstein statement. In fact, all that was retained from P.S. 1553 by the prosecution at the Tribunal appears in volume 27, pp. 340-42. Two invoices for Zyklon B are found there (out of 12), but of the Gerstein statement there is not a word.

On December 30, 1963, Mr. Jacques Fauvet answered that the statement of Gerstein had, indeed, not been "taken in consideration" but that "he hesitated to prolong the controversy." In a word, I was right, but the readers of *Le Monde* were not to know it. The controversy remained open in their columns, but only to those who supported the merits of the argument of the play. Such are the mechanisms of conditioning public opinion. I need not comment further.

FOOTNOTES

1. This name is not legible. Wirth?, Poliakov says in a note. 2. In other versions of this document, the dimensions of these rooms are given as 4 x 5, or 20 sq. meters, not 25; note also that the Poliakov version of 1951 does not give the dimensions of the rooms, but only their ground area, or 93 square meters.

Appendix C:

The Wolfgang Grosch Statement and a Report of a Second Lieutenant to a Lieutenant

1. The Wolfgang Grosch Statement

The following is the statement of Wolfgang Grosch which is quoted from *Le Pitre ne rit pas* by David Rousset:

The undersigned Wolfgang Grosch attests and declares that the following is true:

... Concerning the construction of the gas chambers and their crematory ovens, the people of office C were responsible for the construction, after office D sent the order. The chain of command was this: office D got in touch with office C. The C.I. bureau laid down the plans for these installations, in so far as it concerned just the construction alone, then sent them to bureau C. III which took care of the mechanical aspects of these constructions, such as, for example, getting the air out of the gas chambers, or the fittings for the gassing. Then bureau C. III turned over the plans to some private company, which was to supply the special machines, or the crematory ovens. Always in channels, bureau C. III notified bureau C. IV which sent the order on via the Inspection Division of West, North, South and East Constructions, to the Board of Directors of Constructions. The Board of Directors of Constructions then transmitted the construction order to the respective directive offices of concentration camp construction, who then had the construction proper built by the prisoners which the D. III office put at their service. Office D gave the orders to office C. and the instructions concerning the dimensions of the constructions and their purpose. Fundamentally, it was office D which gave the commands for the gas chambers and the crematory ovens, signed: Wolfgang Grosch. (Emphasis added.)

This deposition was given to the Nuremberg Tribunal. If it was not entirely Grosch's doing, the gibberish in which it was drafted seems to have been scrupulously respected by the translator, obviously to keep up the confusion. The following points, however, cannot escape the reader:

1. It is only a question of the *construction* of gas chambers, and not of their intended purpose or their use;
2. The witness refers back to facts whose materiality could easily be established, and to "instructions" which could be published, but which, nevertheless, seem to have been carefully avoided, particularly concerning the purpose of the gas chambers, to which an allusion is made.

3. Out of all the construction projects for the camps (living quarters, infirmaries, kitchens, workshops, factories, and the like), whose planning and building were consigned to office D, the gas chambers and crematory ovens were picked out and, in a singular manner, juxtaposed, with the object of better impressing upon public opinion the idea that the crematory ovens were designed as instruments of genocide for the specific use in the concentration camps; such a conclusion is unwarranted since cremation is a common practice -- just as common as burial -- all over Germany. For all these reasons, no historian can ever accept this deposition as reliable historical data.

2. Report of a Second Lieutenant to a Lieutenant

David Rousset also cites the following report in his *Le Pitre ne rit pas*:

501 P.S Kiev, April 16, 1942 (Reich Secret Business)

No. of postal sector: 32,704 B.N. 40/42 To S.S. Obersturmführer Rauff

Berlin, Prinz Albrechts, 8.

The overhauling of the vehicles of D groups and group C is completely finished. Although the vehicles of the first series can be used, even in bad weather (nevertheless it must not be too bad) the vehicles of the second series (Saurer) bog down *completely in rainy weather*. When, for example, it has rained, if only for half an hour, the vehicle cannot be used. It simply slides. It is not possible to use them except in perfectly dry weather. The only question that arises is one of knowing whether the vehicle can be used right at the place of execution when it is stopped. First of all, the vehicle must be brought to the place in question, which is only possible if the weather is fine.

The execution place is usually 10 to 15 km. away from the main roads, is chosen ahead of time, and not very accessible. It is completely inaccessible if the weather is damp or rainy. If the persons are brought on foot or by car to the execution place, they see right away what is going on, and become restless, which is to be avoided as much as possible. The only solution left is to load them in the trucks in the assembly area, and then take them to the place of execution.

I had the vehicle of group D. disguised as a gypsy wagon, and to do this I had one little window put on each side of the small cars, such as are often seen on our peasants' houses in the country, and two of these little windows on each side of the large cars. These vehicles were caught onto so quickly that they got the name "death cars." Not only the authorities, but even the civilian population, called them by this name, as soon as they were seen. In my opinion, even the disguise will not long keep them from being recognized.

The brakes of the Saurer vehicle which I drove from Simfiropol to Taganrog proved to be defective en route. The S.K. of Mariupol found that the brake handle worked on both oil and compression. Persuasion and bribery on the part of the H.K.P. did the trick, so that a form was made from which two handles could be cast... When I arrived a few days later at Stalino and Gerlowka the drivers of the cars complained of the

same defects. After an interview with the commanding officers of those *Kommandos*, I went at once to Mariupol to have two other handles made for each of the vehicles. According to our agreement two handles will be cast for each car and six more will be sent to *S.S. Untersturmführer* Ernt for the cars of group C. For groups B. and A. handles can be got from Berlin, since their shipment from Mariupol northward is too complicated and takes too much time. Little defects in the vehicles are repaired by the technicians of the *Kommandos* or groups, in their own workshop.

The bumpy ground and the unbelievable condition of the roads and highways, little by little wear out the connections and the waterproofing. They asked me if we then had to have the repair work done in Berlin. But this would cost too much and would require too much gasoline. In order to avoid these expenses I left an order to have small soldering jobs done on the spot, and in case this should prove impossible, to telegraph at once to Berlin, saying that vehicle P.O.L. No.... was out of service. In addition, I gave an order that all the men should step away at the moment of the gassing so as not to have their health affected by any possible emanations of these gasses. I would like, on this occasion, also to make the following observation: several *Kommandos* have their vehicles unloaded by their own men, after the gassing. I drew the attention of the S.K. in question to the damages, as much moral as physical, which these men were risking, if not immediately, at least a little later. The men complained to me of headaches after each charging. The regulation, however, cannot be modified because it is feared that the prisoners (2) used for this work might be able to seize a favorable moment to flee. To protect the men against this disadvantage, I beg you to issue ordinances in accordance.

The gassing is not accomplished as it should be. In order to finish the job as soon as possible, the drivers always press the accelerators to the bottom. This chokes the persons to be executed instead of killing them by putting them to sleep. My directives are to open the throttle in such a way that death is more rapid and peaceful for those concerned. They do not then have such disfigured faces, do not leave behind them so much elimination as we have seen until now.

Today I am going to the station of group B. and further news can reach me there.
Signed: Dr. Becker *S.S. Untersturmführer*

This report comes as support for an affirmation of Eugen Kogon who writes in his "*Enfer organisé*":

... they (the S.S.) also used traveling gas chambers: they were autos which on the outside looked like police vans, and which on the inside had been adequately equipped. In these cars, asphyxiation by gas does not seem to have taken place very fast, since they usually rolled along for a long time before stopping and unloading the dead bodies. (Page 154)

Eugen Kogon, who does not tell us if any of these death vehicles have been found, does not cite this report either

In any case, the translator is to be congratulated, for although he failed to satisfy one's curiosity about certain things, he at least gave the text an extraordinary Latin cast in the expression of thoughts. And it must be noted:

1. That it is easier for the present researchers to uncover documents about what went on at Mariupol than about what happened at Dachau;
2. That, instead of an order that was issued by a ministry, being placed in evidence, what we have is the simple letter *between a second lieutenant and his lieutenant* concerning the matter;
3. That even if this letter is a genuine document, it does not seem that any of the vehicles were found; at least, if any were found, very little publicity was made about the discovery.

The matter is still at issue, but, as we have seen from the proceedings of the Chelmnno trial at Bonn, March 6, 1953, another version has been brought forward: it is no longer a question of Saurer vehicles. It was discovered in the meantime that the Saurer firm had not been making that type of vehicle since 1912! Rather, now it is claimed that the vehicles were American-made trucks that were designed for the disinfecting of troops while on campaign. These trucks, it seems, were furnished to Germany by the United States at the time of the Spanish Civil War. Further, it is claimed that vehicles of a similar nature were built by the Germans.

Verily, witnesses to anything can always be found!

FOOTNOTES

1. It is curious that this report of a second lieutenant was found, but not the written order with which it is concerned; or at least, it is curious that the one was published and not the other.
2. What prisoners?

Afterword

by Mark Weber
of the Institute for Historical Review

It is difficult to imagine anyone better suited to be the great pioneer of what has become known as Holocaust Revisionism than Paul Rassinier. This French professor of history was a non-Communist Socialist who was arrested during the war for "passive resistance" activities, which included helping to smuggle Jews into neutral Switzerland. Rassinier was then sent to the Buchenwald and Dora camps in Germany, where he remained an inmate until the end of the war. When he returned to France, he was astonished by the stories that were being circulated about the camps, and he felt honor-bound to tell the truth as he knew it. For example, a French priest who had also been an inmate at Buchenwald claimed to have seen "thousands and thousands of persons" going into gas chambers there. When Rassinier met with the priest and pointed out to him that no one was ever gassed at Buchenwald, he replied: "Right, but that's only a figure of speech. . . . and since those things existed somewhere, it's not important." (pages 129-130 of this volume. See also: M. Weber, "Buchenwald: Legend and Reality," *Journal of Historical Review*, Winter 1986-87.) Rassinier was a man of rare courage and conscientious devotion to historical truth. In spite of poor health he traveled many thousands of kilometers across Europe to meet with persons who claimed to have personal knowledge of mass killings. (p. 271). As he put it, "... A historian worthy of the name should not suppress anything that he knows which is relevant to the subject under discussion." (p. 282). His obvious intellectual honesty contrasts sharply with the deceitful spirit of "Exterminationist" historians such as Leon Poliakov, Lucy Dawidowicz and William L. Shirer. Rassinier's work has stood the test of time remarkably well. His basic thesis -- that there was no German policy or program of extermination, and that the incessantly repeated figure of six million Jewish wartime dead is a gross exaggeration -- has been abundantly confirmed by a tremendous amount of new evidence collected by the scholars who have followed in his path. All Revisionists owe a great debt to this man. Some of the more important of those who have built upon the foundation he laid are Dr. Arthur Butz of Northwestern University, Prof. Robert Faurisson of the University of Lyon (France) and Henri Roques, who knew Rassinier personally. (Incidentally, Dr. Butz provides a useful summary of Rassinier's work in his book *The Hoax of the Twentieth Century*, pp. 10-11.) It cannot be emphasized too strongly that the case for the Revisionist view of the Holocaust story is immeasurably stronger today than it was when Rassinier died in 1967. Because Holocaust Revisionists challenge an official and prevailing view of history, they have a tremendous burden of proof. They are held to a much more rigorous standard of accuracy than most historians. This was dramatically demonstrated, for example, in the essentially political trials of Revisionists Robert Faurisson in France and Ernst Zündel in Canada. Rassinier was in frail health when he wrote most of the works that have been brought together in this volume. And because he was a pioneer who worked virtually alone, a number of errors unfortunately found

their way into his writings. These mostly minor errors are neither malicious nor deceitful, which is shown by the fact that they are not crucial to his central thesis. It may even be said that these mistakes underscore Rassinier's basic honesty. If he were alive today, he would be the first to revise his findings in the light of more complete and accurate information. Thus, in the spirit of historical accuracy that Rassinier himself vigorously supported, the following corrections and explanatory points are offered:

1. Rassinier mistakenly maintained (page 288) that the first accusation that the Germans were exterminating the Jews was made in 1943 by the Polish Jew Raphael Lemkin in his book, *Axis Rule In Occupied Europe*. In an effort to discredit Rassinier and all Revisionists, the prosecution in the 1988 "Holocaust trial" of Ernst Zündel emphasized this point, although it is not at all crucial to the Revisionist thesis. Actually, the first extermination claims were made, and widely publicized, in the summer and fall of 1942 by the World Jewish Congress, and particularly by its president, Rabbi Stephen Wise, who was also head of the American Jewish Congress. The World Jewish Congress mounted a well-organized campaign to pressure the Allied governments to endorse its extermination claims. The result was the joint declaration of 17 December 1942 by the United States, Britain, the Soviet Union and the other Allied governments, which charged that the Germans were putting into effect "Hitler's oft-repeated intention to exterminate the Jewish people," and that Jews were being "deliberately massacred in mass executions" in Poland. A few years after the war, the World Jewish Congress boasted in its official history, *Unity in Dispersion*, about its crucial role in bringing about this declaration. The declaration, which the Allies exploited for propaganda purposes, was issued in spite of warnings by the American and British officials responsible for European Jewish affairs, who stressed that there was no evidence for the Jewish extermination claims. (See: D. Wyman, *The Abandonment of the Jews*, esp. pp. 73-75; and the review by M. Weber, *Journal of historical Review*, Fall 1985, pp. 369-373.)

2. Rassinier cannot be faulted for an editor's footnote on page 203, which erroneously alleges: 'It seems that the American Jewish writer Meyer Levin was hired by Otto Frank, the father of Anne, to write the Anne Frank *Diary*. Levin did not write the *Diary*, but rather an adaptation of it for the screen and stage. The *Diary* is nevertheless suspect for other reasons. (See: R. Faurisson, "Is the *Diary* of Anne Frank Genuine?," *Journal of Historical Review*, Summer 1982, pp. 147-209.)

3. It is not true, as Rassinier wrote on pages 219 and 292, that Prof. Salo Baron of Columbia University claimed that there were 700,000 Jews in Poland at the end of the war. Baron actually claimed that there were 73,955. (*New York Times*, 25 April 1961, p. 2 1.)

4. The enormous reparation payments by West Germany to Israel and world Jewry are not calculated on the basis of six million Jewish dead, as Rassinier asserted. (p. 214).

5. Rassinier devoted considerable attention to the ambitious task of estimating the number of Jews who perished in Europe during the Second World War. (pages 288-399). Unfortunately, reliable and complete data on this point, especially for Poland and the occupied Soviet territories, are not available. As a result, it is difficult to estimate the number of Jews who perished during the war years with any precision.

Regrettably, some of Rassinier's citations of figures from other sources, including those of Raul Hilberg, are not entirely accurate. Rassinier concluded that 'the number of Jewish victims of Nazi persecution, in concentration camps or otherwise, should be placed at about one million, more or less, (p. 390) and he estimated that as many as 1.59 million Jews may have perished altogether (p.398). Given the lack of complete data, these estimates are about as reasonable as any that have been made. Interestingly, they closely match the estimate of 1 to 1.5 million Jewish wartime dead reached independently by the respected Swiss daily *Baseler Nachrichten* (13 June 1946, p. 2)

. 6. Readers may be surprised by what Rassinier wrote on pages 164 and 270-283 about the gassing story. Although he never believed that there was any German program or policy to gas Jews, for a time he took the view that gassings were carried out on a small scale by a tiny number of sadistic SS men, who acted contrary to orders. I have been reliably informed that in the final years of his life, Rassinier became increasingly skeptical that even small numbers of unauthorized gassings ever took place.

7. The abbreviation 'T' appears a number of times in this book (for example, on pages 232-34, 237, 239, 246, 251). This refers to a volume (Tome) in the French edition of the official 42-volume 'blue series' record of the Nuremberg International Military Tribunal. Readers should keep in mind that the pagination is different, depending on which edition of the series is consulted.

8. A minor mistake in editing appears on page 239, lines 13 and 15 from the bottom. The documents referred to here are actually Nuremberg documents NO-4401 and NO-4473. Similarly, the "document No. 4463" referred to on page 245, line 7, is actually Nuremberg document NO-4473. (See: A. Butz, *Hoax*, p. 116). These corrections should not discourage the reader from digging into this important volume, which is a valuable memoir of concentration camp life, as well as an insightful and often brilliant critique of the Holocaust extermination story. -- Mark Weber

**THE REAL
EICHMANN TRIAL**

or

THE INCORRIGIBLE VICTORS

by

PAUL RASSINIER

Translated from the original French
INSTITUTE FOR HISTORICAL REVIEW

ÉDITIONS DE L'AAARGH
Internet, 2002

The original edition of this book was published under the title of *Le Véritable Procès Eichmann ou les Vainqueurs incorrigibles* copyright by Les Sept Couleurs, Paris, 1962.

This edition incorporates additions and modifications by the author and is thus not entirely identical to the original French edition.

The Real Eichmann Trial or The Incurable Victors by Paul Rassinier

Published in the United States by
Institute for Historical Review
Post Office Box 1306
Torrance, California 90505

Manufactured in the United Kingdom

ISBN 0-911038-48-5

Library of Congress Catalog Number 76-19192

First Printing May 1976
Second Printing March 1979
Third Printing October 1983
Internet edition 2002

CONTENTS

Foreword	5
Introduction	7
I.– From Stalingrad to Nuremberg	30
II.–The Principles of Nuremberg	40
III.– Conspiracy and Crimes against Peace	50
IV.– War Crimes	75
V.– Crimes against Humanity	88
VI.– Conclusion on Nuremberg	121
VII.– The Eichmann Trial or The New Master Singers of Nuremberg	130
VIII.– The Auschwitz Trial	155

FOREWORD

A confirmed total pacifist, Paul Rassinier was drawn into the Communist Party in 1922 at the age of 16, by the anarchist Victor Serge. Having very quickly turned against it, he was expelled from the Party. After various attempts at unifying the workers' movement along the political lines of Souvarine, and the trade union projects of Pierre Monatte, he joined the Socialist Party on the evening of February 6th, 1934. As Secretary of the Union of Belfort, he leaned first towards Marceau Pivert, then towards Paul Faure, and attempted to popularise in Franche-Comté the pacifist viewpoints of Félicien Challaya, René Gérin, Madeleine Vernet and Louis Lecoin. In 1939 he was saved from Daladierist fury by Paul Faure.

As one of the founders of the "Libé-Nord" movement (he was in the Resistance from the very start) he tried to inculcate into his comrades the idea of non-violence and the principles of total pacifism. This attitude caused him to be condemned to death by the Communist resistance; after receiving the warning coffin effigy, he only escaped pistol shots thanks to being arrested by the Gestapo (October 30th, 1943). He was deported to Buchenwald, then to Dora. On his return to France, invalided out and decorated with the Médaille de la Résistance, and Reconnaissance Française, he resumed his place at the head of the S.F.I.O. union in Belfort. He loudly proclaimed that whilst in the Resistance he had never met most of the men now speaking in its name and, firm in his own personal experience, he attacked their pretensions of having suppressed "collaboration". Rassinier was defeated in the first Constituent Assembly elections by the Communists, who kept him out by giving their votes to the far Left candidate, but he was elected at the second. He was again defeated on November 10th, 1946 through the Communists' using the same method. The state of his health did not permit his resumption of his post as professor of history and geography so he retired from public and professional life and published successively:

Le Passage de la Ligne, 1948 [sic]

Le Mensonge d'Ulysse, 1950

Le Discours de la Dernière Chance (introductory essay to a doctrine of Peace on the theme: "Neither Moscow nor Washington"), 1953

Candasse ou la huitième péché capital, 1955

Le Parlement aux mains des banques, also 1955

Ulysse trahi par les siens, which is complementary to *Mensonge d'Ulysse*, 1960

L'Équivoque révolutionnaire, 1961

Le Véritable Procès Eichmann ou Les Vainqueurs incorrigibles, 1962

By the same author:

Passage de la ligne, (Editions Bressanes, 1948) out of print.

Le mensonge d'Ulysse (Editions Bressanes, 1950) out of print.

Le discours de la dernière chance (Editions de la Voix de la Paix, 1953) Introduction to a doctrine of peace.

La Fin du règne de la peur (Editions de la Voix de la Paix, 1963).

Une 3ème guerre mondiale pour du pétrole? (Editions de la Voix de la Paix, 1963)

Le Parlement aux mains des banques (Contre-Courant, 1955)

Candasse ou le huitième péché capital (L'Amitié par le Livre, 1955)

Ulysse trahi par les siens (Librairie Française, 1961)

Le mensonge d'Ulysse (Librairie Française, 5th ed., 1961)

L'Équivoque révolutionnaire (Défense de l'Homme, 1962)

Le véritable procès Eichmann, ou Les Vainqueurs incorrigibles (Sept Couleurs, 1962)

Translated abroad, in German and Spanish

Le mensonge d'Ulysse, 1960

Ulysse trahi par les siens, 1961

Le véritable procès Eichmann, ou Les Vainqueurs incorrigibles, 1963

The present volume in English is a revision and completion of these three works.

In preparation:

Partis et politiciens devant la guerre

Le Troisième testament. History of the State of Israel.

INTRODUCTION

1867. European statesmen are trying to see Europe in terms of nationalities well defined by natural frontiers. On the other hand, the socialist movement (the Internationale) is ideologically committed to breaking down national barriers. Similarly the merchants value commercial contacts over and above the frontiers, natural or not.

The merchants are the more practical. In striving towards their industrial and social objectives peoples cannot fail to learn to understand and respect each other. Statesmen encourage them in order to extend their influence, whilst the intellectuals do it on principle. Since 1850 the method of contact has been the universal exposition*: in 1851 in London, in 1855 in Paris, in 1862 again in London.

In 1867 the venue reverted to Paris. In order that the foreign visitors could see something other than the exhibits assembled in the enclosure set up on the Champs de Mars, with an annexe on the island of Billancourt, in other words that it might be possible for them to make a far broader contact with France through the intermediary of Paris, the organisers of the exposition published a catalogue of all that there was to see, or at least all that they wished to be seen: *Paris-Guide*. The task of writing the preface for that kind of inventory of the riches of Paris was awarded to Victor Hugo. Here is the passage of that preface which summarised the theme on which he wrote it:

"In the twentieth century there will be an extraordinary nation. This nation will be large, but that will not keep it from being a free nation. It will be illustrious, rich, thinking, peaceful, cordial to the rest of humanity. It will have the gentle seriousness of an elder sister [...]. A battle between Italians and Germans, between Englishmen and Russians, between Prussians and Frenchmen will seem to it as a battle between Picards and Burgundians might appear to us. It will consider the waste of human blood as useless. Only with reservations will it approve an admiration for the war dead. The shrug of the shoulders that we give to the Inquisition it will give to war. It will look at the battlefield of Sadowa with the air with which we regard the Quemadero of Seville. It will regard as stupid the oscillation between victories, invariably ending in a dismal readjustment of the balance - Austerlitz always paid for by Waterloo. It will have about the same respect for authority that we have for orthodoxy; a court case will seem to it as a heresy trial seems to us and it will no more understand Béranger in a cell than Galileo in prison...

[7]

"A common language, common currency, unity of measure, unity of meridian, unity of law; the highest degree of free enterprise and incalculable profit, resulting in the abolition of parasitism; no more arms races, the gigantic expense of defence eliminated, the four billions which the permanent armies cost at the present left in the pockets of the citizens, the four million young conscripts re-assigned to commerce, agriculture and industry; everywhere the iron of the sword and chain reforged in the form of the plough; peace, the goddess with eight breasts, majestically seated in the midst of men...

* In reality the idea came from earlier times; the first manifestation of this kind, although more modest because of its purely European character, took place in Prague in 1781. But, although it was followed by several others of the same nature organised in Paris under the First Empire, the Restoration and the reign of Louis-Philippe, the Napoleonic wars and their consequences resulted in a lack of universal appeal until 1851, in London.

"Instead of war, emulation. The rise of intelligence towards the dawn. Impatience for well-being reproving mistakes and fears. Every other anger disappeared. A people prodding the bowels of the night and extracting an immense clarity for the profit of humankind. That is what that nation will be.

"And that nation will be called Europe. "

The fact that the twentieth century in question, now in its second half, does feel itself threatened with the prospect of ending up in the middle of a Slavic Europe, or a Sovietised Europe, says enough of Victor Hugo's posthumous predictions, not to labour the point. The only thing necessary to comment upon concerning the great hope thus formulated is its intention and the manner of its expression. Especially the manner of its expression: the nationalities, the natural frontiers, German unity, Italian unity, etc. If one had pointed out to him that he did not make mention of these, I imagine that Hugo would have answered with the same shrug of the shoulders as if he had been asked to pronounce a definitive solution to the problem of the Guelphs and the Ghibelines, the Armagnacs and the Burgundians (Picards and Burgundians, as he says), of Richelieu and the House of Austria, of the Hundred Years War, or for all I know, the crowning of Clovis.

Well! Nationalities, natural frontiers, etc. that was again for Europe to try to find herself on an intellectual level which, compared with today, might seem relatively elevated. I do not wish to speak here of either statesmen, who only conceive of Europe as cut in two, or of merchants whose only concern seems to be a multiplicity of frontiers because by means of import and export licences a black market in gold is permitted as well as other devices as profitable as they are numerous. In modern nations the statesmen and the merchants are not, or are no longer, the elite. What of the intellectuals?

If, now that the war of 1939-1945 is ended, the intellectuals have begun to exalt Europe again, they do so only by systematically citing the reasons for not doing so, specifically: the German crimes, the German concentration camps, an infinity of Oradours, Prussian militarism etc. Recently they have tried to mobilise world opinion concerning the behaviour during the war of a simple German lieutenant-colonel - Adolf Eichmann: eternal Germany, that black sheep from which all evil comes, and with which no association is possible except by keeping it on its knees or stretched out with a knife to its throat.

It is certain that public discussion, if kept on the low level of such archaic ideas and in such flagrant contradiction of reality, can only prolong the old quarrels, not settle them, and that Europe has no chance to take stock of itself. To be otherwise it would be necessary to conceive of a Europe not only without, but also against Germany.

More important than anything, and this is a serious point, is the fact that the intellectuals of 1962 do not see:

On the one hand, that the Germans could easily reply with Dresden, Leipzig, Hamburg (tragic counterparts of Oradours); French militarism (or Russian); Algerian concentration camps (which the International Red Cross established to be no better than their own); or Russian camps, which have been found to be far worse than the German camps by Margareth Buber-Neuman, who was in both. Navareno Scavioli, an Italian Communist refugee in Moscow in 1925, who knew the camps from 1937-1954, has given us (in the Rome magazine *Vita*, November 23rd, 1961) a picture which surpasses in horror everything that has been written by the escapees from German camps - even by those who have embroidered their tale the most.

On the other hand they do not see that there is not, nor ever can be, a war without concentration camps, without Oradours and without obedient and zealous lieutenant-colonels of the Eichmann type - on both sides.

Finally, in determining responsibility for the war of 1939-1945, the intellectuals overlook the consequences of the aberrant Treaty of Versailles which places the first and heaviest responsibility on those who made that Treaty.

Immediately after the first World War these were still indisputable truths for the majority of intellectuals. Among those who classified themselves on the Left and who made up the literary or personal associations of my ardent and enthusiastic youth, were: Harry Elmer Barnes, Sydney B. Fay, Fr  derik Bausman, Hermann Hesse, spiritual heir to Bertha von Suttner,

Romain Rolland, Alain Mathias Morhardt, Victor-Marguerite, Anatole France, Félicien Challaye, Jean Giono, Georges Démarial, René Gérin, Barthelemy de Ligt, Lucien Roth, the Alexandres, Georges Michon etc. Nobody has succeeded in selling them the idea of any unilateral character of horrors and responsibilities for the war. They put everything under the microscope and were very hard on the men of Versailles, who were supported by a few aged intellectuals, worn out or fossilised, and belonging to a Right which no longer followed them. They created a *Société d'études documentaires et critiques sur la guerre** of which Mathias Morhardt was the president, and in France their works were published in the Librairie du Travail by the militants of anarcho-syndicalism of which the *Révolution prolétarienne* was and still [10] is the medium of expression.

In 1945 when hostilities terminated, of the very few people at that moment thinking it necessary to sift out the horrors and responsibilities for the second World War, it is remarkable that they were all Right-wing and that their attitude was founded on the very principles in whose name the intellectuals of the Left had repudiated Versailles twenty-five years earlier. As for the intellectuals of the Left, the overwhelming majority approved and exalted Nuremberg in the name of principles with whose reactionary character, at the time of Versailles, they had reproached those on the Right who made them their own, and the phenomenon is no less remarkable. There is a curious kind of shifting of position here in the matter of principles, and it is just in this shifting that my personal drama took place.

Although politically involved, I remained committed to the basic tenets of history. The Left was my spiritual family. I had found intellectual comfort in a socialism which was above all a humanism, nourished on a hope based on an interpretation of historical facts which attempted to achieve objectivity through honesty. At the moment when (I don't know what devil possessed them) the intellectuals of the Left, confronted by the war and then by the Résistance, fell back upon the political positions of that Déroulède kind of nationalism which even the most extreme of those on the Right had long since repudiated, I suffered as much as if my own family had become guilty of some collective felony. Was it a panic reaction on the part of the Leftist intellectuals in the face of danger, or was it deliberate repudiation? Hope springing eternal, I opted for the former explanation. The danger was removed - at the price their attitude had forced us to pay, that is, the war - and now, after the war, the hour had come for the settlement of accounts. I discovered that, far from returning to their traditions and principles, they were thinking only of how they could justify the untenable political position they had assumed during the conflict with insupportable theses, and to this end did not hesitate to pervert historical facts even to the extent of the solicitation, falsification, misinterpretation and invention of documents. I knew then that I had hoped against hope and that theirs had been a deliberate repudiation. At the same time I knew that neither my political and philosophical convictions, nor my concern for historical truth and my honesty would allow me to ever associate myself with that disavowal, nor to allow myself to be suspected of it.

Once again this decision presented delicate problems. The intellectuals' lack of scruples was as complete in other realms of thought as in that of history. Through the medium of propaganda, a general intellectual breakdown had infected all classes of society [11] and now was threatening everything - a moral prostration, forerunner of the collapse of society (at least of European society) after an apocalyptic war: the dark prospect of a chaos no less apocalyptic. It was obvious, therefore, that the pressing job to be undertaken required an immeasurable effort. Everything had to be started again from scratch and since the University could not be counted on, itself a victim of subversion, it was necessary to address the masses directly, sorely tried as they were by events that they had not understood (and which were still so fresh in the mind as to be festering) and saturated with slogans aimed solely at stirring up their lowest instincts, particularly resentment, hatred and the need for vengeance.

Fortunately the zero mark was well defined. Buried under mountains of sophistry was that need for truth (where the concerns of the historian meet those of the moralist) which, even under the worst circumstances, all normally constituted men always feel sooner or later. There lay the

* Society for documentary and critical studies on the war.

only hope, and that hope directed the first step: attack this mountain at its foot, take the facts one by one, study their substance in order to replace them correctly in their historical context.

It was an interminable labour. Disregarding the urgency it finally ended up as a general study of the Second World War. But we were only in 1948 and such a study was not possible, no doubt because of lack of perspective, but especially because of the result of that - the paucity of documents made public, after having been carefully rewritten. Even those made public one could not consult directly without special privilege, that is, knowing the password. It should be recognised that the archives of the Third Reich, seized in 1945, amounting to hundreds of tons of documents, were carefully kept out of sight during the whole term of the thirteen Nuremberg trials. And during the trials only those who were willing to become auxiliaries of the prosecution before public opinion were allowed access to the documents. In an effort to avoid leaks even that access was restricted to those documents which the prosecution lawyer decided presented no threat to his addresses to the Court. When the trials were over, this enormous mass of papers was transported to America and put under lock and key in a huge military warehouse in Alexandria, Virginia, where it lay in dust until 1955. At that time, before handing the documents back to Germany, the American government authorised a very small, carefully selected group of scholars and researchers to make an inventory and select certain documents to be photographed. Today the mass of documents lies in the dust in Bonn where, under the law of fifty years' obligatory secrecy, specialists will not have free access to them for another thirty-two years, that is, about 1995. Moreover, they will have to be classified before they can be made available, which task will no doubt take a number of years thus pushing the date even farther along. Until then, historians will have to content themselves with [12] the 30,000 documents (it might as well be nothing) which were used by the prosecution at Nuremberg, a few of which the attorneys for the defence succeeded in procuring through the wiles of an Indian and which are deposited in an official dossier of 67 large-size volumes of about a thousand pages each.

These 30,000 documents in 67 volumes have been made public - but great heavens! what a form and what a state they are in! - in successive instalments, on the following dates:

1. *Nazi Conspiracy and Aggression* (red series): 10 vols. in English, publ. in 1947 by the Gov. Printing Office at Washington, under the direction of Ch. Horky, W. Jackson and others.

2. *Report of the discussions and decisions of the trials of the Major War Criminals, which took place at Nuremberg in 1945-46* (blue series): 42 vols. in 4 langs. (French, English, German and Russian) publ. at Nuremberg itself in 1948.

3. *Trials of the War Criminals Before the Nuremberg Military Tribunals* (green series): 15 vols. in English, which give a report of the discussions and the verdict of the twelve succeeding trials at Nuremberg, publ. 1950 by the Gov. Printing Office in Washington, under the direction of the Control Council Law No. 10, with the assistance of Drexel A. Sprecher and others.

Because the ex-Allied governments only publish their own archives in dribbles, and then only to the extent to which they show the Allies in a favourable light; and because, on the other hand, one cannot pass judgement on the value of the memoirs of the principal actors in the drama without being able to confront them with all the documents relative to the events of which they treat - probably not until about the year 2000 - all the general studies published on the Second World War are bound to be very vulnerable. That is also true of those which were pretentiously issued in 1948.

To provoke a discussion on the actual principle of the Nuremberg trials was unthinkable. I did attempt to do so in 1946, within the bosom of the Socialist Party of which I was a representative in Parliament, succeeding only in bringing down upon myself unanimous indignation.

In 1948, therefore, the only thing a historian could do was to turn to partial studies, limited to the documents and testimonies then made public. In order to be effective he had first to turn his attention to those documents and testimonies which had reference to events concerning which public opinion had been conditioned by official propaganda. Without any

doubt the event above all others which best answered that condition was the phenomenon of the concentration camp, which had taken precedence over all others during the preceding three years, thanks to the abundance of eyewitness literature and the invariable return of all public debate on policy with regard to Germany, as defined at Nuremberg, to the subject as though to a leitmotif and in search of justification. It so happened that I had the notable advantage of [13] being able to speak as a witness since I, too, had lived through it. It was, therefore, impossible to resist the temptation to set things right and so it was that *Le Mensonge d'Ulysse* was my first act of fidelity to the principles of the world of the Left of 1919. After an interval of ten years, in an effort to end the bitter controversy which it had stirred in Europe and which had lasted all that time, *Ulysse trahi par les siens* was my second act. It had barely appeared when Eichmann was kidnapped in Argentina by the Israeli Secret Service in the most complete and brazen contempt of International Law. The controversy was resumed more vigorously than ever and it gave me the long-awaited opportunity to make a collective study of all the horrors of the 1939-45 war. I had the opportunity, at the same time, to set them in their historical context, this context being best defined by a parallel drawn between the thirteen trials of Nuremberg (without, of course, overlooking the fourteenth which took place in Jerusalem), the Treaty of Versailles and the uncovering of the basic causes for the first time. *Le Véritable Procès Eichmann ou les Vainqueurs incorrigibles** was then my third act.

To submit to American opinion all at once and in a definitive form (i.e. documented, since nothing in history is definitive unless documented) a sum of nonconformist truths of such importance that European opinion had not been able to grasp them except in steps and homoeopathic doses - and then only at favourable moments - is an idea for which I am indebted to one of those rare persons (survivors) faithful to himself and to those who, immediately after the First World War, did not accept the declaration of Germany's unilateral responsibility. In this respect Harry Elmer Barnes was a not inconsiderable leader to the student youth of which I was then a part. To him I must here give public homage, not only for that fidelity which so many others have betrayed so brazenly and with so little shame, but also above all for the counsel of inestimable value which he has given me.

For my own part I confess that this passage from homoeopathic dose to horse medicine, without transition, is not made without some misgiving. Rightly or wrongly, from afar I think of the American reader as being much better protected, by the most modern, powerful and efficacious media, against assaults on the truth than the European reader, subject as he is to the old propaganda systems used here. So I consider the American reader less well prepared to face an aspect of things which, in my opinion, is almost totally unknown to him and which in any case is not the sort of thing to be encountered so brutally. Even if my concern is misplaced, I may be excused if, in trying to put him into the picture, I find it necessary to supply supplementary explanations about the basis of the problem - the reasons which forced the victors to find the solution they did and to justify a method which [14] can only be described as such because of the care I have taken to obey the imperative of reality without ever exceeding its explanations of the atrocious psychological climate in which all my efforts in the direction of historical truth have until now been pursued.

In the 4th century B.C., legend tells us, the Gallic chieftain Brennus overran Etruria and, going from victory to victory, he arrived at the gates of Rome, whose population had fled at his approach. He entered the city and destroyed it except for the Capitol, in which the youth of the city had enclosed and barricaded themselves. After a siege of seven months the young Romans, reduced by famine, sent to ask him on what conditions he would raise the siege and depart. "A thousand pounds' weight of gold," he replied. While the gold was being weighed, after adjusting the balance in one of the trays which held the weights several times - doubtless hoping to move Brennus to granting a remission by making him touch the gold with his own finger - the chief of the Roman delegation, whose charge it was to hand over the gold, bade him observe that it was indeed a very great amount. "Vae victis!" replied the other insolently, throwing his

* The Real Eichmann Trial, or The Incurable Victors

sword onto the weight tray of the scales and indicating by a gesture that brooked no reply that, for having said too much too thoughtlessly, the Romans would have to pay this additional weight of gold too. In those times the only law was the unwritten law, creating only very simple judicial situations. "Between thine and mine" distinctions, not very fundamental on the individual level, did not exist at all on the level of groups of people for whom property rights were guaranteed only insofar as they could be preserved by force. In consequence the principle of war, which was a common occurrence, was never the subject of any discussion. As for the effects of war, the loser had to pay tribute to the conqueror not because he had become guilty of some prejudicial misdeed which it would have been just for him to make good, but solely because he was the loser. The tribute itself was at the discretion of the victor and could range from a sum in cash to pure and simple annexation of the invaded territory, varied only by the enslavement or extermination of the population. The law of the jungle this came to be called later and, because it was moderate in the sense that its terms never irremediably reduced men to the habits of animals, this evaluation was, on the whole, coarse enough.

However, history seems to show that even given their victory especially the price they generally made the losers pay for it, the victors have, so to speak, always had a bad conscience. And not only the conquerors but the disinterested spectators also. The chronicler who put the Brennus story into legend and with a single phrase, which has deservedly become part of history, laid down the martial customs of his times and thus the whole law for all wars for centuries to come, clearly did not approve of the behaviour of his hero. Otherwise, legend for legend, instead of [15] bringing in last minute Roman reinforcements which caused Brennus to flee and leave his booty behind, he would certainly not have failed to conform to the literary pattern of his times, and make a conqueror of his hero right to the end of the tale, which would then have been a song of praise. Although only an implied condemnation, which brings to mind either the imminent or providential justice in which man successively or simultaneously believed for so long, it most certainly bears only on the effects of war and not on its cause. Nonetheless it betrays a bad conscience and the need for a justice that is not armed. And history seems to show that it is after the event, in the effects of his acts, and not before in his spirit or conscience, that man found the idea for that justice.

Since Brennus, man has made little progress in the direction of a good conscience: for the use of victors after wars he has invented the principle of the just war, the basis of which is historic law. For before wars he has invented nothing that can prevent them with any certainty.

Historic Law is the title of ownership to a given piece of land for a people. It is not inscribed in a notary's archives but only in tradition, essentially religious in nature. In the earliest ages of humanity, after the Flood in which everybody except his own family was drowned, the good father Noah, who had three sons, divided the whole earth between just two of them at God's command. Sem, the first, took the East. Japhet, the second, took the West. Chain, the third, was given nothing because, having seen his father drunk and naked, he was not in a state of grace in the eyes of God and, therefore, belonged to the race of the cursed. The unhappy man turned towards the South because there was nothing but mountains in the North. But that South land, which rapidly became the rich Land of Canaan because of the industry of his sons, he occupied without right. When the descendants of Shem, to whom the East had been allotted in the division, were pushed back by armed force, they did not know where to settle. The God of their fathers suggested to them that, since it had been occupied without right, the Land of Canaan was at their disposal, especially since the inhabitants were cursed - doubly so for having taken another god. With His help they exterminated their cousins in order to take their place.

Thus the notion of a just war, the legacy of the Old Testament, was born in Christian morals, based on the Law of divine jurisprudence, whose justification was the state of grace. "God's will!" or "For God and the King!" became the saying throughout Europe in the Middle Ages. This law is called historic because the history of Noah is related in the Old Testament and because, the Old Testament being an historic document, it follows that the events reported therein are likewise historic. Deduction has never been more advantageous: Noah himself a witness for history ...

Everything happens today as if all the people in the earth, [16] considering themselves descendants of Noah, were continuing to dispose of his legacy by invoking the first division he made of it, and by taking a stand on a kinship which has transformed from being family-based to become nation-based. Unfortunately, even if it were one day possible to agree about the legitimacy of this categorisation of "nationality" it would never be possible to agree on the allotment of territory to be made to each nation. Unfortunately, too, there are peoples who do not recognise themselves as descended from Noah, and who base historic law on other reasons.

So it is that Historical Law, from the point of view of the first occupant, recognised or not by a God, is the fundamental reason for modern nationalism and, all things being interdependent, it has given rise to another idea - patriotism, which throughout the ages has evolved in the direction of a much more temporal and, at least in appearance, more consistent judgement than the state of grace of divine jurisprudence. Nationalism has attached to itself other laws less rudimentary than Historic Law. So much so that the idea of a just war can call to its support a whole arsenal of sophisticated arguments which only broaden the field: country, national interests, integrity, and independence, democracy, state policy, the right of self-determination, international justice, civilisation, liberty, revolution, socialism etc., even to philanthropy in the case of colonial wars. And all this, integrated in a philosophic system, pursues its murderous career in the minds and lives of men in the name of humanism.

In the end, in the name of no matter which of these myths, after every war justice always belongs to the victor, and the guilty one is always the loser: the intellectual and moral development of humanity has not yet reached the point where it is self-evident that by definition the victor is not necessarily the one with reason, only the stronger, and that the relations which should in justice necessarily exist between the judge and the party concerned cannot make an exception of war. By virtue of which it is hardly possible to demonstrate, without recourse to Machiavelli, that manners and customs are essentially any different from those of Brennus, or that the law of the jungle is definitely ended.

The two world wars having proved that the system was powerless to put right on the side of the victors, even with all the arsenal of arguments and sophistry, Machiavelli was not just an additional assistance, but the only recourse. In 1919 at Versailles, no attempt was made to prove the unilateral responsibility of Germany in the unleashing of hostilities: it was decreed and to make the decree acceptable to the people and even the victors, who demanded an accounting, they undertook to show, after the event, that during the war Germany had committed the most abominable crimes. Thus indirectly and all at once came justification for the war waged against Germany, the victory and the odious clauses of the Treaty of Versailles which practically condemned her to death.

[17]

Such is the origin and explanation of the gigantic campaign to manipulate public opinion which flooded the world, fed by the celebrated *Bryce Report*, in which were gathered and, so to speak, classified like samples, an enormous mass of the most unbelievable horrors and atrocities (all fictitious, of course) which were brought to Germany's account. But, less than five years later, the *Bryce Report* was pulled to pieces thus destroying forever the reputation of its author who, until then, had been a statesman, a journalist and a humanist, universally esteemed for his intellectual integrity. Homage must be paid here to the Englishman, Arthur Ponsonby, whose book *Falsehood in Wartime* created a sensation at the time, and served as a basis for the counter-campaign immediately undertaken by the *Society for Documentary and Critical Studies* on the War to detoxify the evidence and re-establish historical truth, and to all those scholars and artists courageously associated with this work.

Not for an instant did the victors even pause to acknowledge that this criticism was validated by the inherent feebleness of their argument. Without hesitating, they attributed it to the fact that they had omitted to invest it with the authority of legality. In 1945 they were still in this frame of mind and, certain that there had only been this little error in their method, they decided this time not to decree that Germany was unilaterally responsible for unleashing the war, but, in order to lend the argument what it lacked in 1919, to make use of horrors and

atrocities for the legal proof of this guilt - Nuremberg. As an additional precaution they did not mince words over the horrors and atrocities, but gave the full dose: concentration camps, gas chambers, six-million Jews etc., etc. They took up where the Belgian baby with no hands left off (which was, I think, the most that was dared in the *Bryce Report*). You cannot stop progress!

Twenty years later, in versions constantly repeated, elaborated upon and, above all, augmented, all the insanities recorded at Nuremberg as so many incontestable truths are still disseminated amongst the public, profusely and to order, through a whole literature as ethical as the judges at Nuremberg, and financed from all over to accomplish this pathetic campaign* Against this, even if it has already scored points or obtained appreciable results, the counter-campaign of detoxification has not yet really managed to take shape.

The authority of legality? Not even that - only control over the mass media. The Second World War did not provoke in Europe the considerable upheavals in the structure of society brought about by the First, which had had a comparable influence on [18] American policy. It did not make a break with the past as the First had done. While the First broke radically with an evolution of the world in the direction of increasingly more liberal policies, the latter tended towards regimes of which Stalin, Mussolini, Hitler, Franco and so many others have together quite well defined the type. The new element is that in the clan of the victors, the political team which won the war has remained in power, with very few changes in personnel, is still in power, and maintains the team of its choice within the clan of the victors, controlling everywhere the means of subversion.

The dimensions of the crimes of this War being more frightening than those of the war of 1914 - and with good grounds! - every effort is made to hold off the hour when the people, discovering the monstrous subterfuge of which they were and still are the victims, will surely demand an accounting from them.

As far as the Second World War is concerned such is the drama of historical truth. Happily, it is only that. Historical truth no longer being determined by logic, only by the imperatives of policies, it would take only a trivial incident - even something unconnected with it - to suddenly modify the mutual interests of the victors, to shatter their solidarity, in order to set the problem in its true context again and assure its triumph. It is not impossible. Suppose for example - an extreme and probably entirely gratuitous hypothesis - that the United States reverted to the policy of isolation which is in their tradition, perhaps the sense of objectivity might be restored to them too, in which case, since they would not lose their position of leadership in the world for all that, things would surely move very fast.

Now to apply the theory to the facts. The evidence was glaring; it was a question of a war which was, in the beginning, merely a clash of purely national interests (those of Germany and Russia associated with those of Poland and the litany of little artificial states created haphazardly by the Treaty of Versailles) degenerating into a European war (with the intervention of Britain and France and the spectacular shift of Russia) and then into a world war when the United States entered the lists (Lend-Lease law), and when Japan (Pearl Harbor) refused to submit to a policy, inherited from the experience of colonialism, which the United States intended to impose on her. This evidence was glaringly obvious even to the victors themselves and not just honest men.

Two intellectual attitudes were possible: 1) either the problem presented itself as a chain of events associated with a chain of responsibilities; in that case, the good old logic of Aristotle (which the present infatuation with Hegelian-Marxian dialectic has not yet torn to pieces) pointed out that only the initial responsibility counted - in this case the Treaty of Versailles; or, 2) the facts could not be rationally linked together. Thus it was only a question of a succession of events related fortuitously by chance and, in this case, each one carried its particular responsibilities. So [19] it was legitimate to maintain that Britain's and France's declaration of

* If it was willingly admitted that responsibilities for wars could be determined by their cause, it was only one of the pernicious effects of the logic of our fathers. In the modern logic of the victors those responsibilities are defined by the consequences invented for them and laid to the conscience of the losers.

War on Germany (rather incoherent since it spared Russia against whom the same complaint could be made as against Germany) bore, without any reasons other than those relative to the gratuitous hypothesis, the responsibility for transforming a war of national interests into a war of European concern and that, in conjunction with the imperialist policy of the United States towards Japan, the 'Lend-Lease' law carried the responsibility for its transformation into a world war. Aggravation - it was also just as legitimate to maintain that not only had Britain, France and the United States made the Second World War inevitable (rejection of the compromise peace by Britain and France after the fall of Poland, and by Britain after the fall of France) but, even more, that all three together had prolonged it by torpedoing, through the Casablanca Declaration (January, 1943 - demand for Germany's unconditional surrender) the movement in favour of peace which originated in Germany at the beginning of 1942, on the basis of the *status quo ante* (*Schellenberg Memoirs*, Paris, 1957), and which thereafter had developed there.

Neither one nor the other of these two attitudes could be adopted by the victors. It goes without saying that the latter condemned them outright, from the moment of Britain's and France's declaration of war on Germany, and for everything that followed. The former implied a condemnation of the Treaty of Versailles, the violation of which they brandished as the greatest of all their grievances against Germany. Quite a poem, the Treaty of Versailles. America had refused to ratify it; Russia, who took no part in its formulation, had until 1934 condemned it as an act of banditry, and again, from August, 1939 on; Britain had suggested a revision after 1923 and, together with Germany, had even partially achieved it in 1935. France alone remained stubborn and it was no small pleasure for her to see manifested, once again, a unanimity around her point of view, whose least advantage was that it carried with it implicit and total absolution for the most serious of all the violations of this treaty: namely, her systematic refusal to apply the disarmament clause. At the other end of Europe pleasure became jubilation because, with the Treaty of Versailles condemned, the right of self-determination of peoples was recognised and it meant the final blow to Pan-Slavism which Bolshevism, as in the times of the Tsars but now under the mark of the revolution, had made the keystone of all the foreign policy of Russia.

At Yalta and other places it was decided that Russia had given proof that she had returned to the fold of the concert of the Nations, and the attitude adopted, without letting its bastard character appear, was the following: the world war was envisaged in the first instance as being a rational chain of events, each evolving from the preceding, the initial responsibility being fixed [20] not on the origin, that is the Treaty of Versailles, but arbitrarily as the events progressed by using an argument according to which the one responsible for any war was the one who, breaking off negotiations aimed at a compromise, set his armies on the march. For twenty long years, from 1919 to 1939, endless discussions attempting to define the aggressor were carried on without success, and there, in a trice, produced on paper without too much effort was just the right formula. It was as simple as that. I must admit that, with both conditions united in one person - the rupture of negotiations and the marching order to the armies - it made a serious argument. Unhappily in 1939, the one who had broken off negotiations was not the first to set his armies on the march. In a remarkable book, *Der erzwungene Krieg* (The forced war) (Tübingen, 1962), the American historian David L. Hoggan, supported with documents and testimonies, has indisputably established that it was Poland, as the docile instrument of Britain, France and Rooseveltian America, who had broken off negotiations, in order to present Germany with the Hobson's Choice of putting her armies in the field. In a similar way, Poland had put her own armies into position, which reveals sufficient about her intentions and those of her inspirers to be presented as supplementary, though superfluous, justification to David L. Hoggan's argument.

To be sure, the victors were not unaware of this aspect of things since they had planned it themselves. And they had only the less confidence in the solidity of the argument. Then again, among all the arguments in their philosophical arsenal, there was not one which, even resorting to sophism and begging the question, could not be turned against one of them, often several of them, sometimes all of them, and all together against Russia. So, having fallen upon the horrors

and atrocities, they had barely had time to set the mechanism of the operation in motion before they perceived that, of all those things which could be charged against Germany, there was not one on which Germany could not hold up a comparable charge against them. Gas chambers? Perhaps, but the proof is far, very far, from being established. With the exception of one, in all cases the opposite is proved. In the one remaining case, contrary proof has not been made because it is a question of a camp (Auschwitz-Birkenau, the very one charged with the greatest number of the worst crimes) located on the other side of the Iron Curtain where nothing can be verified, and where the fabrication of false documents is raised to the level of an institution. Whereas atrocities of a comparable kind - aerial bombardments with the phosphorus bomb of the civilian populations of Dresden, Leipzig, Hamburg etc., which in a quarter of an hour in the middle of the night turned 200,000, 300,000 or 500,000 people into human torches - were, alas, clearly proved, and that even in 1945 (without counting Hiroshima!).

Worse than an impasse - a trap. The evidence had to be admitted. No sophist, by no matter what dialectic trick, could [21] find justice in the victors' conception of it. Machiavelli himself would have failed! There was only one way: the subversion of public opinion. But the situation was so delicate that, from the very beginning, it was necessary to mobilise every instrument controlling information to insure against any possibility of failure. And so coercive measures to silence honest people became part of the law. So infamous were they that, even to distant posterity, nothing will be able to cleanse the conscience of those who introduced them.

Two new offences, relative to criminal law, were invented: 1) sympathy for Nazism or Fascism, and 2) anti-Semitism. After that there was no longer any possibility of saying or writing anything at all on the War which did not conform to the official line, without falling under one or the other of these indictments - or more often both - that is to say, not without being automatically sentenced with very heavy fines or prison, coupled with the loss of civil rights, which deprived one of the means of subsistence. Temerity being the ransom of honesty, some eminent intellectuals took the risk nevertheless, and there were many such cases.

But to prohibit the search for and publication of the truth merely by taking such Draconian measures would be ineffectual without additional sanctions to prevent, without any chance of a loop-hole, the action coming to light in the natural play of the traditional mechanisms of the administration of justice. Therefore a special law was made. At any rate one was needed because international law was without any provisions for even initiating a trial. Furthermore, even with the law elaborated, it still could not be applied to the war just ended, the principle of the nonretroactivity of law forbidding it formally and explicitly. There was no wavering in the face of this difficulty. Coldly it was decided that the 2,000 year old principle of the nonretroactivity of laws was not applicable to this war. As for the truth, the law prescribed that the prosecution could dispense with judicial proof of the materiality of the facts of the accusation, every time they became a matter of public knowledge. The number of facts admitted as incontestably of common knowledge, because they could not be proved, is incalculable. And to seal any crack through which the truth might escape, a whole list of arguments was drawn up which the Defence, the accused and their witnesses did not have the right to make use of. This precaution was unnecessary at least in the instance of the witnesses. They were all either themselves accused and in prison, or likely to be, and it is easy to understand that their testimonies were inspired, in the first case, by the anxiety not to aggravate their situation and if possible to alleviate it, and in the second case, by the concern not to put themselves in a worse position. A psychological service was attached to the Tribunal under the direction of Professor Gustave Gilbert of Long Island, whose task it was to remind those among the witnesses [22] who did not seem to be sufficiently inspired of that concern. He obtained remarkable results by every possible means.

With these steps taken and nothing overlooked, everything was set; and with public opinion needing a scapegoat, as after all collective disasters, the operation could not fail to succeed. For the moment at least. The psychological atmosphere created was dreadful. It had not been necessary to protect the Tribunal against the suspicion which its sentence might arouse; it was already protected by the traditional laws and jurisprudence through contempt of court, a

charge which could be brought against those who might be tempted to summon them before public opinion.

I have the soul neither of an apostle, nor of a hero, nor of a potential martyr. I am not daring by nature. If I have performed any acts of courage which have attracted attention, it was only in taking calculated risks of such a kind that I could very easily bear the possible consequences. And if once I did expose myself in such a way that for sixteen months every morning on waking, I was faced with the thought that there was every reason why I should not be alive in the evening, it was due to a simple miscalculation of the actual possibilities offered in the combination of circumstances in which I had acted. Fear of death? More serious and more terrible than that. I was convinced that I had acted like a man totally deprived of intelligence and good sense. Taught by experience, at no price did I want to expose myself to an error, to be sure of lighter consequence, but just as serious in that it would be of the same kind. Refusal to do one's duty? Certainly not, just a rejection of sacrifice. In this state of mind, if duty demanded that I object to the operation and speak up, it also commanded me to act more intelligently this time than I had against Nazism during the German occupation. My first concern, therefore, was to evolve a strategy which would save me from finding myself again in the role of Don Quixote battling against the windmills.

I proceeded by elimination. To argue over the responsibilities for the war was not only dangerous, it was hopeless. On the one hand, the perspective necessary to the historian did not exist; on the other, public opinion, conditioned by subversion, would not have tolerated it. Today we are up against the second of these. Until we have indisputably established in the eyes of public opinion that the flood of calumnies which the victors have laid on the conscience of the defeated is only the fruit of a deranged imagination, at the service of the most absolute dishonesty, it will not be possible for us to fix its attention on the true facts of the responsibilities. I speak only of public opinion because, in the eyes of all objective people, proof has now indisputably been made, and it remains only to broaden the field of objectivity.

Having discarded as hopeless the question of the official line on the responsibilities, only the Ponsonby method remained. And it was necessary to be very prudent. I knew that I could not escape [23] being brought up before some court, but I also knew that to achieve anything efficacious, I must at all costs avoid being found guilty. And there were three offences with which I must never allow the judges to charge me: defence of Nazism or Fascism; anti-Semitism; and contempt of court, mentioned above, without counting a fourth which has always existed in ordinary law - injury and defamation of character of those I brought up.

Defence of Nazism or Fascism, that was easy. A long past proved that I was neither one nor the other. I had just come out of a concentration camp into which I had been thrown for that very reason, and I had just been decorated twice as an official recognition, without myself having taken the slightest step to obtain these two distinctions.

Anti-Semitism, that was a little more difficult. Everything that did not tally strictly with the postulations of the Jewish documentation centres, which had sprung up and were to be found almost everywhere, was considered relevant to this offence. And if I was not actually anti-Semitic, I was nevertheless in trouble with the international Zionist movement for having always maintained that to claim the right to settle sixteen to seventeen million people on the twenty to thirty odd square kilometres of Palestine territory was economic idiocy, apart from the fact that the law of history which was the basis of reference for the project, as demonstrated by Renan, was quite another Issue in the legal sense. They were waiting around the corner for me. I evaded their move by deciding not to bring up explicitly any of the arguments originating in the Jewish documentation centres. At the time, moreover, the Nuremberg trial was playing the Zionist game much better than any Israeli writings, or they themselves, could have done. Those centres and their attachés were very discreet - so discreet that they presented little to take hold of. It was only later, about 1951-52, that they entered the fray and took the lead in counteracting the emergence of historical truth, and I think I was no stranger to that kind of reaction.

As for contempt of court, there was no problem. One simply brought up the Nuremberg judges without implicating them, that is, without naming them. It was quite easy. One attacked only those witnesses on whom the judges had based their opinion. And here I was in my own

field, the study of the witness and his testimony being, in a way, part of my profession. I knew that if the witness for the defence is almost always a decent sort, he who makes an accusation is almost always a bad character - only concerned with painting things black in order to get a condemnation, a shameless liar, and who could be exposed in *flagrante delicto* at every point of his testimony. In sum, a sadist. As an -extra precaution, I brought up the former only indirectly, and then only by making use of that whole body of literature which so embroidered the testimony that its use will be the shame of our century.

[24]

It was only the offence of injury and defamation against which I was not protected, no matter what I did. But since injury and defamation are not in my nature, I could only think of protecting myself in one way: to write nothing I was not in a position to prove, so that if I were brought up before any court I could put a stop to those who incriminated me, and the judges. Naturally, it would never occur to me to tell a falsehood. But there are two kinds of truth: those which can be proved, and those which cannot. The number of the latter was considerable, truths for which proof did exist, but not in my hands and which could only be found in places impossible to reach; and, at the same time, it was impossible to reveal where the proof could be found for fear of exposing it to destruction. I had to remain silent for both reasons. May future historians have no fears; I have left plenty of meat for them!

A final precaution which the moral climate in which we lived seemed to impose on me - the homoeopathic dose, to which I have referred. After three years of reflection and research, *Le Mensonge d'Ulysse* (Ulysses' Fable) was conceived on the lines of a parallel between the unanimous testimony of all the other witnesses on their experience in German concentration camps, and my own experience for sixteen months. I had thought that there was no better method than to reconstruct these camps in their true aspect, in that it permitted me not only to bring to light everything about which they had maintained a strange silence, but in addition, with regard to the administration of justice, to catch them in the act of lying. Before making it public, I submitted the manuscript to a jurist among my friends, of world repute in matters of freedom of speech, asking him to point out to me everything that could warrant a judgement of injury and defamation in case of a lawsuit. He only had to make a few corrections, on form only, here and there a word of expression easily replaced by an inoffensive synonym. Then he had me show him legal proof of all that I claimed. I was able to do this impeccably.

Thus the idea of homoeopathic medicine came to me, of publishing the two parts separately. The first, which narrated only my personal experience and implicated no one, and which consequently gave no pretext for any legal involvement whatsoever, could not fail to provide a favourable climate for the second. If need arose, I would always be able to bring the two parts together into a single volume under the title I had chosen. Thus, I published this first part with the innocuous title, *Passage de la Ligne* (1949) (Over the Line of Demarcation).

The idea turned out to be a good one. On the whole, the reception was favourable and encouraging. There was, of course, some gnashing of teeth. On the part of the Communists, for example, whom I had handled pretty roughly, but, incredible as it may seem, the crime of anti-Communism had not (yet) been provided for.

[25]

I waited for this first part to produce its effect - two years, during which time I published the second, with the true title. In court I easily proved my case; I was of course acquitted. But the adversary did not consider himself beaten. On appeal he managed, thanks to complicity on the spot, to have me sentenced with a heavy fine and with damages, with a suspended jail sentence, and an order to destroy the book. In the third and last suit I won the case, as was foreseen. On the 24th day of May, after four years of proceedings, all the papers published the final judgement, summed up for Agence France-Presse:

"The criminal division of the Supreme Court of Appeal set aside the judgement of the Court of Lyon which had sentenced, for injury and defamation, the 2nd of November, 1951, M. Rassinier, author of the book *Le Mensonge d'Ulysse*, M. Paraz, author of the preface, and editor of the work, to imprisonment and fines, and to pay damages to the National Federation of Deportees and Resistants.

"The Supreme Court objected to the sentence:

"1. On the penal level for having upheld crimes of injury and defamation, when the criticisms of patriots in the book are, to be sure, unfair and malevolent, but are of a general character and addressed to no one in particular.

"2. On the civil level, for having declared admissible the action of the F.N.D.R., when this organisation has not been directly referred to in the book, and not one of its members has been attacked personally."

So I had injured and defamed no one. In declaring that, the Supreme Court at the same time declared that all that I had said was recognised to be true, since the crime of injury and defamation could not be established except by proof to the contrary. The least to be deduced from this sentence was that with all the material available to it, the prosecution could not provide this proof. It was correctly said that my criticism was "unfair and malevolent" towards the patriots, but what criticism is not, to the one under attack? The nature of this appreciation is indeed so subjective that the law has never made it a crime.

The point was won. Now at last a bit of historical truth, not negligible although unrelated to war responsibility, was itself found to be covered, paradoxically, although in irreducible contradiction to the truths of Nuremberg, by the authority of the Courts, and it could be made use of without risk in all the public proceedings. A breach was made in the wall, and through this breach one could pass to arrive at other truths. I did not fail to, and since then many others have followed after me. Today there is hardly any risk in contesting, even in their smallest detail, all the arguments of the victors on the unilateral guilt of Germany. But in France, in the year in which *Le Mensonge d'Ulysse* appeared, four or five rash people, who had not felt it necessary to take as many precautions as I did in entering the fray, were pitilessly and [26] harshly sentenced. Among them, Maurice Bardèche (*Nuremberg ou la Terre Promise*, Nuremberg or the promised land) and Henri Fabre (*Le 15 août et la Libération de Tulle*, The 15th of August, and the Liberation of Tulle). Such cases are countless within Germany itself.

I will spare the reader the abominable calumnious campaign in the European press of which I have since been the victim, and which the judgement of the Supreme Court did not cut short. It was the Socialist Party which supplied the theme: in 1951, without waiting for the outcome of the case investigated, and without even considering the facts of the case. I was thrust out of the bosom of the party on the pretext, true enough, that what I was saying made light of what Nazi or Fascist strength remained in Europe. As if the evolution of modern societies in the direction of authoritarian forms, for 50 years observable all over the world, did not stem from the fact that every time they needed to save face the democratic forces have not drawn back in the face of the shameless lie. As if Hitler had not been the end result of the great lie of Versailles, and as if the astonishing progress of Bolshevism since 1945 was not the result of the great lie of Nuremberg.

The argument of the Socialist Party against me spread like a drop of oil. Progressively I became a camouflaged collaborator, then a neo-Nazi, then a member of the governing board of the neoNazi Internationale. It was even " taken up by one of the leading contemporary Philosophers, M. Merlau-Ponty, Professor at the Collège de France, who wrote to me, the 24th of May 1951:

"Historians will have to ask themselves these questions. But in reality, this manner of examining testimonies results in throwing suspicion on them, as if they lacked an accuracy that could justifiably be expected of them. And since at the present time the tendency is rather to forget the German camps, this unreasonable demand for historical truth positively encourages the falsification, and massive it is, which consists in admitting broadly that Nazism is a fable. "

This text gives the measure of the intellectual depths to which we had sunk.

I had good reasons for not being too disturbed. Even before he had the proof, after September 1914, the already non-conformist peasant of the French eastern frontier who was my worthy father had never believed that German soldiers cut off the hands of Belgian children. And he had made it his business to make the truth known. For years he was called an agent of

the Kaiser, "Boche", and "Spike Helmet". In short, I was a chip off the old block. And I told myself that time, which had worked for him, would not fail to work for me.

To go into detail on the complete nonsense grafted onto the principal argument, which for the four years of the proceedings the entire French press echoed every week or two to keep public opinion on the alert, would be to abuse the English-speaking [27] reader. It will suffice to give just an idea of it by citing three particularly significant examples. Six months after it had appeared, the title of *Le Mensonge d'Ulysse* became *La Légende des camps de concentration*. And, in summarising the contents, some hard-up journalist wrote, in the *Progrès de Lyon*, the following, which was reproduced by almost all of his confrères of the Paris press:

"The brutality, a legend! the crematoria, a legend! Electrified wire enclosures, a legend! Death in lots of ten, a legend!"

Finally, in a paper of the deportees, M. Jean Kréher, attorney for the prosecution, came to the rescue with what seemed to him to come right from the heart of my study, and which was also abundantly reproduced:

"So, if we were gorged with the sausages and first class margarine, if everything was foreseen to take care of us, and provide us with the necessary distractions, if the crematorium is an institution required by hygiene, if the gas chamber is a myth, if, in a word, the SS were full of consideration for us, what is there to complain of?"

Decidedly, not all the falsifiers in the world met at Nuremberg. I had, without any particular merit, the wisdom never to reply to attacks against me. On the one hand, I had been taught that silence expresses the deepest contempt, on the other, a sense of dignity kept me from stooping to such low polemics. I admit that in this attitude I also took tactics into account. I wanted to strike only heavy blows, and, to be effective, I had to stick to my method, which, until then, consisted in striking only under favourable circumstances. To wait for opportunities? Yes, but the one quality essential to a historian is never to be in a hurry. In 1960, a series of lectures which I gave in Germany, in intellectual circles, so stirred up public opinion that one of the opportunities was provided - *Ulysse trahi par les siens* (Ulysses betrayed by his fellow men, published in Germany with the title, Was nun Odysseus?). And in 1960 the scandalous arrest of Eichmann in Argentina, the trial given him in Jerusalem, the intensive propaganda to support the whole affair, etc., furnished me, finally, with the opportunity I had been so long waiting for, to present the problem as a whole, *Le Véritable Procès Eichmann ou les Vainqueurs incorrigibles* (The real Eichmann trial, or the incorrigible victors) (1962).

Whether the atmosphere in Britain and America is as favourable to the work as it was in Europe is the question, and to this question, and the reactions it arouses - or does not arouse! - this book is the answer.

"The capitalist régime," Jean Jaurès once said, "carries war within itself, as a passing cloud carries the storm," and this metaphor, of which history offers few so concise, striking and substantial, has echoed around the world. Historians of the school to which I belong, who have made it theirs, will not fail to point out to me that it is the starting point for all studies of the [28] problems of war and peace. One of them once said to me, "You are surely right. Your general theme is surely indisputable in its whole, if not in all its details. But with regard to the basic problem, that of placing the deep-seated causes of the war of 1939-1945 within the framework of the fundamental principles of the capitalist regime, and the function of the institutions which led us into it, your theme is only on a minor matter, and you make two errors. The first is, that in our way of studying the phenomena of war and peace, it is not the Treaty of Versailles which is the primary cause of that war, but the capitalist system which made the Treaty of Versailles what it was. The second is that everyone knows that war, which is itself a horror and atrocity - the greatest and most unspeakable of all - involves in its turn a succession of horrors and atrocities. So it is not necessary to make an exact count of them, with which to charge each side of the fighting line. That is not the problem."

No indeed! that is not the problem, and that is just what I maintain. Moreover, that is why the lesson of examples seems to me sounder than that of precepts, that is why all my efforts tend to draw a parallel between that which should be discussed (the Treaty of Versailles), which would surely lead to a basic study of the problem, and that which is discussed (horrors and atrocities), and the methods used in discussing them. On the other hand, there is no doubt that as long as this atmosphere, poisoned by the horrors and atrocities, is not cleansed, there will be no possibility of turning the attention of public opinion toward the basic problem. For example, to a book so remarkable as *Der erzwungene Krieg* by David L. Hoggan, which incontestably sheds the most light of all that has until now been published on the war of 1939-1945, for any student of this problem. Furthermore, if the air is not cleared, if some day it is ever admitted that the basic problem cannot ever be dealt with, it is not only their horses the Cossacks will water at the Rhine, as an old European proverb puts it (which also adds that on that day the stone eyes of St. Odile of Hohenbourg (Alsace) will weep), but their tanks which they will fill on the spot in the Sahara. For on that day we will have to admit that there is no possibility of integrating Germany into Europe, since the only obstacle to her integration is precisely the campaign directed against her on the theme of the horrors and atrocities for which she is supposedly, and congenitally, forever destined to make herself guilty. However, a Europe without Germany will be, within a short time, not only a Slavic Europe, but a Bolshevised Europe, with a promise of the Bolshevisation of the whole of North Africa, to begin with.

It is the problem of western civilisation which is thus posed. I ask to be excused by the Americans if I think that the terms of the problem depend only on them, because, the leadership of the free world having fallen to them, the intellectual orientation of that world today depends upon their reactions.

[29]

I had thought to present this collective study in the order in which circumstances compelled me to offer it in successive stages to European opinion. Then, as I advanced with the work thus conceived, I realised that, although not having to change a word in earlier writings of 10 or 15 years ago, at every step I had to take into account the new discoveries made by historians during this period, and to integrate them. To avoid the loose and confused tone which would have been unavoidable if I had pursued this track, I preferred to make a general revision, and revert to the classic method of the historians: first the theme, then the references.

The theme includes the two first parts: the Treaty of Versailles and the Nuremberg Trial. The two other parts are devoted to the references: my personal experience and the experience of others, or a study of concentration camp literature, together with a complementary study of the conclusions drawn from them by those fascinated by the subject but totally without experience.

Is it long? Yes, it represents fifteen years of work.

For the average Briton, will it be tedious or disagreeable? Without any doubt, but I neither write nor speak for the average Briton: I am not a candidate for the Prime Ministership!

P.R.

Paris, July 1963

Chapter I

FROM STALINGRAD TO NUREMBERG

Spring 1942. The focus is on the resumption of the general offensive which has been stopped just outside Moscow since December. Everything has been thought out in minute detail. It does not occur to Hitler and his General Staff that it could be otherwise - this time...

The disposition of the forces for a renewal of the attack, and the overall plan of the operations were, in fact, well thought out. A little audacious, if not reckless, indeed ambitious, in the usual manner of Hitler. But has not Hitler's way been tested and proved?

But they were stopped in front of Moscow. Far from holding him accountable, informed circles put the responsibility on Mussolini's anarchistic and unexpected intervention in Greece. The disorderly flight of his army, at the last moment, rashly exposed the right flank, in its initial disposition, and kept the German armies busy for a month repairing the damages, thus delaying getting the operation underway, which permitted the Russian winter to overtake Guderian's panzers. As for uninformed circles, that is, the people, they were not aware of any setback; to them, at the most, it was just some hitch, not disturbing or serious. It would take a great deal more than that to impair Hitler's popularity and the confidence he inspired. The smarting misfortune of the Munich putsch of 1923 did not, and he marked out the twenty years since that time with an uninterrupted series of brilliant and often spectacular victories. Unconquered, he was invincible, no matter what he undertook.

In the first instance, the German armies were to take their position along the Murmansk-Moscow-Stalingrad-Astrakhan line. Once the Russian armies were without provisions, matériel, foods, medicine, furnished them by the Allies via Murmansk, and especially up the Volga via Iran and the Caspian Sea,¹ at the same time without their oil supply from the Caucasus, their front driven back, and their defensive system disorganised, they would have no other recourse than to break up their units, no other hope than to try to reform at the Urals, their last, and the nearest, strategic line of withdrawal, and also the last vital Centre of Russia. But the General Staff of the German armed forces (O.K.W. = *Oberkommando der Wehrmacht*) planned from the beginning to frustrate that possibility. Guderian's armoured forces were to be at the Urals before the Russians could get there. Thrown back on Siberia, her army and equipment captured, with or without capitulation, Russia would be conquered and disabled.

[31]

The breakdown was expected to take place at Stalingrad, key to the Caspian, and hinge of the Russian formations. If the peace proposals, which would be made again to the West, met

¹. The British and the Russians had occupied Iran to make sure of a Provisioning route to Russia via the Arabian Gulf, and they had occupied it in violation of the same legal Principles which they so often blamed Germany for violating.

with the same rejection as those of July 1940 to England, Stalingrad would become the base of operations.

In the second instance, the aim would be to join the armies engaged in Russia with those operating in Africa under the command of Marshal Rommel, at Basra on the Arabian Gulf.²

However, Hitler hoped it would not be necessary to go as far as Basra to make his victory decisive and permanent. With Russia crushed, Britain, in order to avoid the loss of the Middle East and Egypt (which would mean the collapse of the Commonwealth, and which would reduce her to the minor role of being a bridge-head for America), would give in, and just as surely in that case, it would be unthinkable that America would remain determined to continue the war.

German troops at the Urals and at Basra would mean, of course, removal of the last hesitations of Spain and France, and then North Africa. Economically speaking it would mean an enormous mass of 700 million people, having at their disposal but under German control, more than half the riches of the world, the surplus finding an outlet in Africa, and especially in an Asia conquered (and protected from the Americans) by Japan. Militarily speaking, it would mean 700 million people, steel clad, solidly entrenched behind an efflorescence of Atlantic Walls and Siegfried Lines of all kinds, an impregnable fortress, and up to atomic standards, against which the Anglo-Saxons' most powerful assault waves would only break up or die of exhaustion. In other words, world leadership. But even if Britain did remain stubborn over everything, America, surely, would not follow her in such folly.

Such was Hitler's calculation. Audacious, reckless or ambitious, and only conditional. The crushing of Russia would put an end to the war, and apparently it lay within his power.

Apparently...

There was nothing classical about German tactics. The merit of Hitler, a strategist on occasion, lay in his having understood that given the excessive length of the fronts, which is characteristic of modern wars and the plague of general staffs, it was not possible to conceive of an offensive as a combination of movements harmoniously developed around a Centre and two flanks, the tradition in classical strategy. On a 2,000 kilometre front, like the one which served as a line of departure (assembly position) for the invasion of Russia in 1941, the three segments of classical strategy were, at 1,000 kilometre intervals, obviously too widely separated [32] to work together or alternatively. To divide this front up into three or four independent sections, with the mission to advance in successive rushes and realignments, in the purest traditions of the art, was incompatible with those requisites of the Blitzkrieg imposed by the time factor, which Hitler knew were playing against him, economically speaking. Therefore, he formed an unbroken line of bases, firmly anchored, from which to send out sudden sorties of armoured columns, to drive a wedge into the enemy formation, then to regroup at a depth of 200 kilometres or more behind them. At the same time, this enemy was to be frontally attacked by assault infantry, and pounded by Luftwaffe dive bombers.

The results were extraordinary, not only in Poland and France, where the front lines were relatively short, but also in Russia. The German armies arrived before Moscow, having averaged an advance of about 1,000 kilometres in six months along the entire extent of this immense front, and they had amassed two million Russian prisoners, nine thousand tanks, seventeen thousand guns. As for the Russian air force, thanks to the effects of surprise, several thousands of their machines had been destroyed on the ground during the first day in massive bombardments by the Luftwaffe.

Russia's immeasurable resources in men and equipment were known. But that she was able to recover herself after such a disaster astonished military experts throughout the world.

Always she pulled herself together, and always it had to be begun again.

From Astrakhan to Murmansk it is 2,700 kilometres as the crow flies. Along the ground it is nearly 3,500 kilometres. Hitler knew that to determine on that objective meant extending by about 1,500 kilometres a front which was already 2,000 kilometres long, and that the main

². In Hitler, *Seigneur de la Guerre* (Hitler, War Lord) (Paris, chez Payot, pp. 86--87), General Halder, former Chief of Staff of the German Army, attributes this operation Plan to Goering, and ridicules it.

question was one of military strength. He resolved the problem by deciding to make use of prisoners of war and civilians in occupied countries, in the war industry, in order to release to the front as many Germans as possible who were in reserved occupations. To execute this decision, Speer was named Minister for Armaments and Munitions in February, and, at his suggestion, Sauckel was made General Plenipotentiary for Man Power on March 21st.

Here there was a little difficulty to overcome in the matter of international law. The Geneva and Hague Conventions prohibited the use of such labour in war industries and in the armed forces.

The articles of the Geneva and Hague Conventions, to which the Prosecutors and Judges at Nuremberg were to refer so often, are, especially those of the Hague, fairly little known. Perhaps it will be useful to give the reader an outline of what, except for this provision and those related to guerilla warfare, these covenants embrace, and which I think can be summarised as follows:

A. On the initiative of Russia and the United States, who wanted to settle the question of the limitation of ground and naval [33] armaments, and the question of the peaceful settlement of international disputes, international conferences took place at The Hague in 1899 (May 18th to July 29th), and in 1907 (June 15th to October 18th).

B. At the first conference (on the initiative of Nicholas II) there were represented all the countries of Europe, a few states of the Americas, and of Asia, twenty-seven in all. And the following conventions were adopted:

a) on the laws and practices of war on land, b) on adapting the Geneva principles of August 22nd, 1864, to maritime warfare; on the peaceful settlement of international disputes.

Declarations to complete these conventions were also adopted: forbidding the launching of projectiles from balloons in air; forbidding the use of asphyxiating or harmful gases; forbidding the use of projectiles exploding within the human body. Finally, a permanent court of arbitration was created, as well as a permanent court of international justice.

C. At the second conference (on the initiative of Theodore Roosevelt, and which was made up of 44 countries) thirteen other conventions were adopted, with particular reference to: compulsory arbitration of international disputes over war on land, naval warfare, the opening of hostilities, maritime seizure, occupation of enemy territory, etc. A Declaration relative to the launching of projectiles from balloons confirmed that of 1899. Finally, a Prize Court was created, but it was not ratified.

D. Two other conferences took place, in 1929 and 1930, for the settlement of the financial debts of the war of 1914-1918. The Young Plan was adopted, and the evacuation of the Rhineland was decided upon.³

It was fairly simple to meet the difficulty presented by the Hague Convention concerning the use of labour. Russia, which had refused to recognise the conventions and had consequently not respected them in Poland or in the Baltic countries, could not honestly benefit from them. And as for the countries which had signed the conventions, the question was resolved judiciously at a government level, after October 1941, through agreements which ended in the organisation of voluntary service, and then in laws instituting the administration of compulsory labour (in France, laws on compulsory labour were not promulgated until October 1942). In countries like Belgium and Holland, where legal power had resigned constitutionally or disappeared, only voluntary labour could be sought.

To the labour force thus obtained could be added, from all of [34] occupied Europe, an important number of persons: members of the opposition, resistants, and franc-tireurs, themselves having infringed the Geneva and Hague Conventions, and no longer protected by any international statute, and who could be deported and put to work in concentration camps.

³. In 1945, the Permanent Court of International Justice was abolished, and was replaced by the International Court of Justice, instituted in the Charter of the United Nations. As for the Permanent Court of Arbitration which still exists, it is in reality a roster of arbitrators, from among whom parties in litigation choose a tribunal; it is supported by an International Bureau and an Administrative Council, both permanent. Then there was the Prize (maritime) Court of 1907, a court of appeal against the decisions of national (municipal) courts, which passed judgement on maritime seizure in time of war, and on whether the decisions of those courts conformed to the Prize Convention.

Indeed, massive deportations were begun in March 1942, and Eugen Kogon gives 2,791,000 as the officially accepted figure for deportees of all nationalities, racial deportation not included, nor the 640,000 or so deportees of the first five months of 1945 (*Enfer Organised*, pp. 34 and 147).

Four to four and a half million Jews living within the European perimeter held by the German forces, of whom about half were of labour age, were officially added to this figure. The situation of the Jews was judicially and materially tragic. Since 1933 a whole series of decrees, in application of the Party programme proclaimed at Munich on 24th February, 1920, and then racial laws, promulgated in accordance with the decisions acclaimed at the Nuremberg Congress in September 1935, had progressively taken away their German nationality in the Third Reich. Since there was no Jewish State with which to make bilateral agreements, or international agreements in the Geneva tradition, and since, in spite of the repeated proposals of the National Socialist Government, no country was willing to authorise their immigration or take them under protection, they lived in Germany, until war was declared, with the status of stateless citizens, which offered no protection, just as was and is the case with stateless aliens in all countries. They are subject to the caprice of power. In November 1938, after the assassination of von Rath, Counsellor of the Embassy, by the Jew Grynszpan, which stirred Germany into a surge of indignation, albeit somewhat organised, they were thrown to the vindictiveness of the public. At the same time, as a reprisal, measures of spoliation were taken against them (which up until then had not been customary) and all the mechanisms of emigration, non-official, semi-clandestine, and in every case, forced, were set in motion. In September 1939, at the beginning of hostilities, representative authorities of the Jewish World Congress, in order to reproach England and France for having delayed so long, reminded them that "the Jews of the whole world had declared economic and financial war on Germany since 1933," and that they were "resolved to carry this war of destruction to the end." In making this move, they practically authorised Hitler to put all the Jews at hand in concentration camps. In times of war this is the customary treatment of enemy aliens in all countries. Progressively, along with military developments, the other Jews of Europe found themselves in the same boat with the German Jews, and when there was no longer any hope of arranging for their emigration from Europe (the last hope, as we shall see, evaporated with the failure of the Madagascar plan, at the end of 1940), it was decided to re-group them all, and to put them to [35] work in a single and immense ghetto. After the success of the invasion of Russia, at the end of 1941, this area was established in the so-called Eastern Territories, near the former Russo-Polish frontier: Auschwitz, Chelmno, Belzec, Maidanek, Treblinka, etc. There they were to wait until the end of the war for international negotiations to determine their fate. This decision was brought into application at the celebrated inter-ministerial conference at Berlin-Wannsee on 20th January, 1942, and the transfer began in March. If the fact that in the spring of 1942 there was a minimum of four million French, Russian, Polish and Yugoslav prisoners in Germany, plus the human resources of conquered Russia, is taken into consideration, Hitler could very reasonably expect to have a foreign labour force of about twenty million people. Enough to protect the war economy and the German army against any manpower shortage.

According to Halder, if his journal is to be believed, Hitler defined his political intentions with regard to Russia to a group of generals on 30th March, 1941. "North Russia to be attached to Finland. Protectorates: Baltic states, the Ukraine, White Russia." On 17th July, after the German-Russian war had started, Rosenberg, after he had assumed his post as Minister of Eastern Occupied Territories, stated the aims more explicitly - "the dismemberment of Russia into component parts, each to become an independent state, or federations of the Ukraine, Ruthenia, Russia, Caucasus." Finally, Directive No. 21 (Case Barbarossa: invasion of Russia) stipulated in the paragraph, - special cases, "Russian territories occupied during the course of operations, as soon as battle conditions permit, shall be organised into states, in accordance with special directives."

When these statements and instructions were circulated through Rosenberg's bureau (and among Canaris' secret agents), they led the Balts, Ruthenians, Ukrainians and Caucasians, all of whom were traditionally hostile to Moscow and even more to Bolshevism, to hope for

independent statehood on the arrival of the Germans, whom they at first received as liberators. In application, they would not only provide the German war economy with the manpower Hitler was counting on, but the army, too, with autonomous legions, fighting at their side - an almost inexhaustible supply of volunteers. And that was the case at first. They were sent to Germany with nine-month or one-year contracts. Then there were fewer and fewer. Then those who went home did not go back again. Rosenberg's declarations and Hitler's instructions became dead letters, as living conditions for the people of the East worsened under the police control of Himmler, the Gauleiters, and the Protectors. A change of heart took place, and acceptance was turned to hostility, all the more because, at the suggestion of the Minister of Economic Affairs and of the Commissariat, the Bolshevik structures of rural land management (*kolkhozes* and *sovkhozes*), which the people hated, had been retained.

[36]

For all these reasons, and others such as the refusal to provide autonomous military legions (it took two long years of negotiations before General Vlassov was authorised to raise two armies in the Ukraine, for example), the recruiting of labour locally, which was the job of Sauckel's bureau, became a veritable man hunt. And it was the same in the West, although for different reasons. When he was interrogated at Nuremberg on the 31st of May, 1946, by the Soviet Prosecutor, Alexandrov, General Plenipotentiary of Man Power Sauckel stated that of the thirty million permanently employed for the German war economy, there were never more than five million foreign workers, not including prisoners of war and persons in concentration camps. The day before, the Prosecutor had tried to get him to admit to ten million, but he would not accept that figure unless it included prisoners of war. Lacking positive information, it is possible to assume that if the accuser intentionally exaggerated, it was to the interest of the accused to minimise. If we make a rough estimate, not counting the concentration camps, and say that at some time there may have been between twelve and thirteen million foreign workers in Germany, a little more than two fifths, and a little less than half of the total manpower, we will probably not be very far from the truth. It was an enormous number, but still nowhere near Hitler's hopes, and the possibilities.

There was another difficulty. To the lack of numbers had to be added the lack of quality because the labour so indiscriminately rounded up was not skilled, and the men in reserved occupations could not be spared in sufficient numbers to satisfy the demands of the front. Finally, with regard to production, while the efficiency of the prisoners of war, on the whole, was almost but not quite at normal level, that of the workers recruited by force and exposed to the police tactics of Himmler's bureau, was very low, and that of the men from the concentration camps, living on an atrocious diet, was about zero. Sabotage did its part too.

It is clear that, together with the partial failure of the Sauckel mission, the fact that so large a proportion of the labour force was so unproductive - either unskilled, or living under conditions that made work impossible, or naturally resorting to sabotage - killed any hope of furnishing the manpower and war materials in the quantity demanded by the military necessities of an operation so vast in scope.

Hope was frustrated all the more in view of the unparalleled waste of productive forces for which the regime, at least in the execution of orders, was cold-bloodedly responsible: the non-racial camp internees who died at a catastrophic rate, not of compulsory labour, but of bad treatment, and the four to four and a half million Jews who were never integrated into war plants, and practically paralysed by the measures used concerning them.

After 1943 it was time for the Allies to think of the organisation of Europe and the world after the war. The era of [37] conferences began.

In fact they had tried to open this era of conferences much earlier. It is hardly an exaggeration to say that the first reply of the United States to the declaration of war by Japan, then Germany, was to call a meeting in Washington on 1st January, 1942, of the twenty-five nations already or about to be at war with the Axis powers, which made up the nations of what was later called the United Nations. But on that date it was not possible to go beyond "a mutual and solemn pledge jointly to continue to the end the war against the Axis Powers." After that, nothing more in that line was attempted, the Allies thus pledging showing themselves to be

much less "jointly responsible" than they had stated. On the British and Americans weighed the memory of the German-Soviet pact and, correctly, the feeling that Stalin was capable of every political about-face. It was duly known after the war, from the direct hints of certain qualified witnesses and from the revelations of Peter Kleist (*Entre Hitler et Staline*, 1953), that during the whole of 1942, and even after Stalingrad, Stalin had multiplied his overtures, through Finland and Sweden, for a separate peace with Germany and that the British and Americans got wind of it. To the Russians it seemed clear that Hitler had declared war on them only to force the West to a compromise. Even after the American landing in North Africa they gave him all the more chance of winning, as the British and Americans plainly delayed opening a second front in the West.

It was only after 13th January, 1943, that any real steps were taken to meet this ambiguous situation. And that was Roosevelt's declaration at Casablanca that no peace with Germany could be considered before an unconditional surrender. In *As He Saw It* (N.Y. 1946, p. 117) Elliott Roosevelt did not hesitate to say that this initiative was "as good as if Stalin had invented it himself." In fact it threw consternation into the German opposition to the Hitler regime, who had been in touch with the Allies through the offices of neutrals since the beginning of 1942 (*Mémoires de Schellenberg*, Paris, 1957; and *Carl Gördelers und die deutsche Widerstand Bewegung* (Carl Goerdeler and the German Opposition Movement) by Gerhard Ritter, Stuttgart, 1954). As for the Hitler regime itself, this declaration inspired it with the energy of despair and strengthened it in public opinion. To Roosevelt's credit it must be acknowledged that in the end (under W. C. Bullitt's influence, who pointed out that he was sometimes able to counteract the influence which his Baruch friends exercised over him) he recognised that the demand for Germany's unconditional surrender could have no other result than to prolong the war for the sole benefit of Soviet Russia. He also sent notes to Churchill and Stalin, on 23rd May, 1944, suggesting a return to Woodrow Wilson's policy, and a direct appeal to the German people over the heads of their leaders, the only stipulation of which was peace on condition of the overthrow of the National Socialist government. [38] But it was a little late for that, and neither Churchill nor Stalin was interested. Furthermore, things had reached a point where he could no longer exert pressure on them.

Be that as it may, it was still only 1943 and the problem of the further evolution of the situation among the Allies, with regard to the unconditional surrender formula, did not arise. What was plain to them was the certainty that the Axis, henceforth unable to resume any military initiative, was virtually beaten. Just the same, they had to wait until the summer for this certainty to be assured, when the Germans and Italians were pushed out of Africa and the British and Americans landed in Sicily, and then in Italy, which spelled the imminent fall of Mussolini; and until October, when they could organise another meeting out of which it was hoped that constructive solutions for the problems of Europe could be shaped on the ruins of Germany.

This meeting took place in Moscow from the 19th to the 30th of October, 1943, between the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the U.S.S.R. (Molotov), of Britain (Eden) and of the U.S.A. (Cordell Hull). It was followed by others: from November 22nd to 26th at Cairo (Roosevelt, Churchill, Chiang Kai-Shek), from November 28th to December 1st at Teheran (Roosevelt, Churchill, Stalin), which was the first meeting of the Big Three. Then came Yalta, and finally Potsdam.

On the 30th of October, the Moscow mission ended with the following declaration:

"In consideration of the fact that the United Nations have, on several occasions, announced their intention of bringing the war criminals to justice, the undersigned Ministers of Great Britain, the United States, and the U.S.S.R. declare that the German officers and soldiers and members of the Nazi party responsible for atrocities and crimes, or who have taken a consenting part in their execution in occupied Europe, will be sent back to those countries in which their abominable crimes were committed, there to be judged and punished according to the laws of the liberated countries and the free governments established there."

Although impossible in all other post-war problems, unanimity was achieved in the matter of vengeance - first and foremost, to have revenge. Since then, the taking of revenge has not ceased and the prevailing atmosphere of this post-war period is that of the underworld. How

could it be otherwise? Marriage between Bolshevism and the western democracies, even if only a marriage of convenience, was just as contrary to nature, if not more so, than between Nazism and Bolshevism, and nothing else offered any possibility of harmony. One sees only that, thinking they have definitely settled Germany's account, the East and the West have finally begun to settle the one they have discovered between themselves.

In his *Memoirs of the Second World War*, Churchill related that when the hour for those toasts which seal agreements had rung at [39] the Teheran Conference, a month later, in the mists of champagne and vodka, the Moscow Declaration was evoked. Bending to Roosevelt's ear, Stalin whispered that it would suffice quite simply to shoot 50,000 officers and leaders. "49,500," the other is said to have answered.

And that illustrates the seriousness of those men on whom the fate of the world depended, and all that could be expected of them.

Chapter II

THE PRINCIPLES OF NUREMBERG

This 'war to the finish', although virtually won by the Allies, was carried on for two more years, precisely because it could not be otherwise after the Declaration of Moscow.

And so on August 8th, 1945, the United States, Britain and Russia, whose company France had been permitted to join, full of all the bitter resentments that such a prolonged and merciless struggle had built up, met together in London as conquerors to draw up plans for the "pursuit and punishment of the major war criminals of the European Axis Powers" - in other words, to draw the practical conclusions of the Declaration of Moscow.

Notice the shift in the formula. It was no longer a question of the Germans alone, but of the nationals of the Axis Powers, and no longer of the "officers, soldiers and members of the Nazi Party responsible for crimes, or who took a consenting part in their execution," but of "major war criminals" without further definition which, in the agreement in preparation, so broadened the field that the prosecution shifted from individual to collective punishment.

This agreement, which bears the signatures of jurists Robert Falco (representative of the provisional government of the French Republic), Robert H. Jackson (U.S.A.), Jowitt (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland), Iou. Nikitchenko and A. Trainin (U.S.S.R.), consists of seven points and says:

a) The establishment of an International Military Tribunal for the trial of war criminals, whose offences have no particular geographical location, to be charged as individuals, or as members of a group, or both. (Art. 1).

b) The return of other war criminals to the countries where their crimes were committed. (Art. 3).

c) For the latter, "national courts" already established, or to be established, will qualify. (Art. 6).

d) To be effective on the date of signature, this agreement "shall remain in force for the period of one year and shall continue thereafter, subject to the right of any signatory to give, through the diplomatic channels, one month's notice of intention to terminate it." (Art. 7).

Article 2 specifies that the "constitution, jurisdiction, and functions of the International Military Tribunal shall be those set out in the Charter annexed to this Agreement" and which forms the "integral part." Article 3 of the Charter declares that "Neither the Tribunal, its members, nor their alternates, may be challenged by the Prosecution, the defendants, or their counsel." Article 3 of the London Agreement initiated a world-wide man-hunt by stipulating: "The Signatories shall also use their best endeavours to make available for investigation of the charges against the trial [41] such of the major war criminals as are not in the territories of any of the Signatories." And Article 5 states: "Any Government of the United Nations may adhere to this Agreement by notice given through diplomatic channels to the Government of the United Kingdom, who shall inform the other signatory and adhering Governments of each such adherence." Only nineteen countries took advantage of this stipulation: "Greece, Denmark,

Yugoslavia, the Netherlands, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Belgium, Ethiopia, Australia, Honduras, Norway, Panama, Luxembourg, Haiti, New Zealand, India, Venezuela, Uruguay, and Paraguay, a total of twenty-three signatories out of the fifty-odd nations which comprised the world then. In Washington, twenty-five nations were represented on January 1st, 1942. In August 1945 the protagonists in this affair did not see that a comparison of these figures in itself constituted a censure in the minds of well-meaning people.

But the practical applications set out in Article 2 of this agreement, and contained in the annexed Charter, were no less strange. The strange can produce only the strange, and only more so. That the very idea of creating all at once a court, jurisdiction, and procedures, without any historical, legal or jurisprudence precedents, did not frighten the so-called civilised nations by its scope and subtleties, can only be explained by the fact that in the chaos of those years they had retrogressed to the level of inexperienced and uncultured peoples. It is a phenomenon related to the psychology of masses whose mental age is lowered in ratio to their numbers. Suffice it to say that the mass expressing itself in this instance, through a few of its members, was several hundred million strong.

What did this annexed Charter contain? First, here is the definition of the offences as set out in Article 6 of Part II of the Charter.

(a) CRIMES AGAINST PEACE: namely, planning, preparation, initiation or waging of a war of aggression, or a war in violation of international treaties, agreements or assurances, or participating in a common plan or conspiracy for the accomplishment of any of the following:

I (b) WAR CRIMES: namely, violations of the laws and customs of war. Such violations shall include, but not be limited to, murder, ill treatment or deportation to slave labour or for any other purpose of civilian population of or in occupied territory, murder or ill treatment of prisoners of war or persons on the seas, killing of hostages, plunder of public or private property, wanton destruction of cities, towns or villages, or devastation not justified by military necessity;

(c) CRIMES AGAINST HUMANITY: namely, murder, extermination, enslavement, deportation, and other inhumane acts committed against any civilian population, before or during the war, or persecutions on political, racial or religious grounds in [42] execution of or in connection with any crime within the jurisdiction of the Tribunal, whether or not in violation of domestic law of the country where perpetrated.

These three principal charges were in reality four. In the list of charges, in fact, the first divides into two: into crimes against the peace, and conspiracy in the intention to commit them - something like that which French law punishes under the heading of "criminal conspiracy." Doubtless the writers of this Charter wanted to make sure that the Prosecutors could establish premeditation, and introduce it under the title "aggravation." Thus, aggravation became in itself a crime.

The two other main charges were already part of the legislation, although summary nevertheless real, of the Hague, and later the Geneva Conventions. In case of war, as we have seen, the belligerents agreed not to act in any way that could be interpreted as unchivalrous, or as a criminal violation of the laws of humanity. For example, civilian populations were protected against bombardment, rape, and pillage; prisoners of war could not be used by the enemy either as soldiers or as workers in armament industries. The wounded were not to be killed or tortured; but no provision was made for franc-tireurs and spies. All that came under the heading "war crime." The Nuremberg Charter made a distinction between this and crimes against humanity, but that was an innovation of form only; the two things were thus distinguished by words, but not in fact.

In the interpretation and treatment of the texts each belligerent was accountable under pain of fine, to police its own ranks and prevent infractions. In practice, this theory, inherited from the personal combat of Knighthood, or the line battles of the Fontenoy type, which no one ever recognised could not be adapted to a confrontation on land, sea and in the air, by masses provided with modern, murderous armaments, was shaped into a standard scenario, good for all wars, and offering infinite possibilities to a propaganda machine designed to maintain the morale of combatants on either side of the firing line. The war, justified by mutual accusations of treaty

violation, in spirit or in letter, continued, justifying itself by mutual accusations of crimes - the Belgian child, the extermination camps, blanket bombing of civilians, Dresden, Leipzig, Hiroshima, Nagasaki, etc. When the war was ended, the world could think of nothing but getting something from the losers: the judgement of God in the modern form of a legal duel inherited from trial by ordeal.

The war which bred these crimes, on the whole minor, and which inevitably implicated them, was nevertheless not considered in itself a crime with inherent legal consequences - the fate of the losers was considered to be within the competence of the political power of the victors. At the level of public opinion, they were the object of abusive sarcasm, indeed, of tribal demands for punishments aimed at their chiefs, but these manifestations revealed [43] more a need to relieve frustrations in mockery than an interest in vengeance. Political power was not to revert to the universally condemned ways of Julius Caesar strangling Vercingetorix in his prison, or of those feudalists of the Middle Ages who sent each other to rot in dungeons. And after that time it did not go beyond the punishment of exile, if, indeed, the losers did not go into exile of their own accord. In demanding that Kaiser Wilhelm II be handed over to the Allies to be judged as the one responsible for a war to which the idea of crime had been attached only because of its length, scope and unequalled ferocity, the Armistice Convention and the Treaty of Versailles - which put an end to the First World War - by creating a process for the jurisdiction of an exceptional court, had taken a step which neither the Treaties of Vienna of 1815 against Napoleon I, nor that of Frankfurt in 1871 against Napoleon III, had dared to do. But, in 1919, the intellectual level of the rulers had not fallen so low that this step could be taken, and it was renounced. Moreover, it should be noted that in 1919 a strong current of world opinion tended to embrace in the same reprobation the rulers of both the victors and the losers, of all the belligerents, and this came within an ace of triumphing.

Thus, if the Nuremberg Charter made innovations in matters of definition, it is only in connection with crimes against the peace coupled with the crime of conspiracy, with regard to its planning and execution (para. a) of Art. 6). But, from the moral as well as the legal point of view, the scandalous thing about this innovation was that it was presented in the form of a law, written for the first time, designed to punish offences, on various grounds, the most obvious of which, if not the most important, being that they had been committed before its promulgation.

The non-retroactivity of laws is, in fact, one of the sacred principles of our culture. And if our moral system holds that "ignorance of the law is not excusable," it is also claimed that where no law exists there can be no offence and consequently no punishment. *Nulla poena sine lege*, the universal conscience is still pleased with itself for having discovered in our heritage from the Romans this formula, which was the basis of their law and more than 2,000 years later, remains the individual's only, and very harrow, protection against arbitrary power.

The answer given to those with mental reservations was "Pure formalism; all of little import, since these people are criminals they cannot claim so much consideration." But, fifteen years later, the Eichmarm Trial, which was Nuremberg all over again - but worse - and which unfolded in an atmosphere of undeniable digapproval, showed more clearly that the problem of the criminal was far from being settled by the definition in the Charter, after the definition of the crime. Everything is linked together. It was self-evident that any objection would be useless. One could, in fact, have argued that at any rate the violation of an everyday rule of conduct, to the detriment of anyone, since it is admitted, [44] would create a precedent to legitimise the violation of all the others, and since the very essence of law is that it is the same for all, the criminal too, is entitled to justice, even purely formal. In this, furthermore, the form was one of the moral requisites recognised by the law, and itself constituted the basis of the legal problem.

It could certainly be said that five years of massacre, of Apocalyptic proportions, had so deeply confused men's minds that the best organised among them could not escape the common fate, and were no longer sensitive to moral requisites and principles. Doubtless this will be said, and with reason. But did the confusion have to be so deep that nearly everyone, including the elite, forgot these requisites, even in the realm of experience? For on this point, at least, history is full to bursting of criminals whom their descendants have refused to recognise and whom circumstantial jurisdictions disavowed the next day.

In a book which made a certain stir and brought its author his hour of fame, a great French teacher of his time, the philosopher Jean-Marie Guyau, who met too early a death (1854-1884), laid the foundation for a moral system which did away with duties and penalties and which, carried over into law, rendered totally useless, even harmful, "the judges, the rack, the gallows and the hangmen" mentioned by Molière.

Although J.-M. Guyau is almost forgotten today, at the turn of the century much was said and written about his ideas, sometimes stupid and abusive things. The anarchists, whose star was rising, immediately adopted him and not only the anarchists, but an important sector of liberal opinion, although only in principle. When President of the Republic Fallières, by systematically exploiting the *droit de grâce* (right to pardon) during his Septennate, practically abolished the death penalty, while Anatole France, whose aphorisms were not always happy, loudly proclaimed his support, as far as common law but not political right was concerned, many good people justified both in Guyau's name, but wrongly because that was an entirely different matter.

Be that as it may, it seems to me that the principal idea to be derived from this remarkable book is this: in not addressing the individual conscience, which is alone of permanent worth since it only can speak in term of justice, but in addressing the collective conscience, of which it is the expression, and which is concerned with circumstances and speaks only in terms of self-interest, the law is nothing more than a precept without fundamental bases, and respect for it, purely mechanical, can only be gained by force. However, to speak of coercion is to speak of revolt, and to speak of revolt is to speak of the relation of forces between society and individuals. What is grievous is that this relation of forces, which is forever defined and re-defined according to circumstances, being [45] in the end its only basis and only justification, the law removes little by little all the strictures of the conscience and leaves to circumstances the distinction between vice and virtue, the delinquent and the honest man, and the margin between them becomes morally non-existent.

And now we are back to the Nuremberg trial. The role of the individual was played by Germany in the persons of its *de facto* representatives - since the rule still holds that Brutus must assassinate or eliminate Caesar, could a people conceivably have *de jure* representatives? The role of society was played by the group of associated nations who were indicting her, after having brought her to her knees. Therefore, it was entirely an affair of circumstances, and relations of forces. Who will deny, for example, that if the military outcome had been the other way around, the trial would have been conceived and carried on in the same way, but with the Allies on the bench of the accused and Germany in the judge's seat? If Hans Frank (writing in *In the face of the gallows*, published by his widow at Neuhaus near Chiemsee in 1955) is to be believed, Hitler had decided, once the war was over, to bring Roosevelt, Churchill, etc. to trial for "war crimes." There is no doubt that he would not have defined the crime with any more respect for form, nor punished the criminal any the less.

This criminal - Article 6 of the Nuremberg Charter presents him in this way: "Leaders, organisers, instigators and accomplices participating in the formulation or execution of a Common Plan or Conspiracy to commit any of the foregoing crimes are responsible..."

The first inescapable observation is that, if in the minds of the authors, this text refers only to Germans, which would represent so high a proportion of criminals in a people that reason would refuse to accept it, in its letter it does not refer only to Germans, thereby raising the figure to a world scale, even less admissible.

When, on October 18th, 1945, after the bill of indictment had been issued, the Tribunal met in Berlin in its first public hearing, to put the finishing touches to the preparations for the Trial, and those criminals had to be named whose crimes were "without geographical location," we find:

Hermann Wilhelm Goering, Rudolf Hess, Joachim von Ribbentrop, Robert Ley, Wilhelm Keitel, Ernst Kaltenbrunner, Alfred Rosenberg, Hans Frank, Wilhelm Frick, Julius Streicher, Walter Funk, Hjalmar Schacht, Gustav Krupp von Bohlen und Halbach, Karl Dönitz, Erich Raeder, Baldur von Schirach, Fritz Sauckel, Alfred Jodl, Martin Bormann, Franz von Papen, Arthur Seyss-Inquart, Albert Speer, Constantin von Neurath, and Hans Fritzsche, [42] individually or as members of any of the Following Groups or Organisations to which they respectively Belonged, Namely:

Die Reichsregierung (Reich Cabinet); *Das Korps der Politischen Leiter der Nationalsozialistischen Deutschen Arbeiterpartei* (Leadership Corps of the Nazi Party); *Die Schutzstaffeln der [46] Nationalsozialistischen Deutschen Arbeiterpartei* (commonly known as the "SS") and including *Der Sicherheitsdienst* (commonly known as the "SD"); *Die Geheime Staatspolizei* (Secret State Police, commonly known as the "Gestapo "); *Die Sturmabteilungen der NSDAP* (commonly known as the "SA"); and the General Staff and High Command of the German Armed Forces, all as defined in Appendix B of the Indictment.

If one takes into account that the text also included accomplices, it was enough to have been a member of the SS, which numbered about 3,000,000 persons (accomplices of Himmler), or to the Hitler Youth with about 13,000,000 (accomplices of Baldur von Schirach), or to the Strength Through Joy organisation, which corresponded to our Friends of Nature, and had about 30,000,000 (accomplices of Ley), etc., you might as well say all of Germany, or very nearly all. Thus it was that since the crime had to all appearances become collective, collective punishment, before which all the moral thinking of the world, except in tribal custom, has recoiled in horror, was introduced into international law. And it was only after eight years of constant effort, in 1953, that M. Raymond de Geoffre de la Pradelle, world famed French jurist, succeeded in having it removed.

All of Germany, or nearly, I said. In fact, even after fifteen years, during which time the population has considerably renewed itself, there is still only a small minority of Germans who have not at least a close relative, if it was not they themselves, who has been tried in a de-Nazification court and sentenced, usually with a heavy fine. And it is enough to read the reports of the thirteen Nuremberg trials to realise that all of Germany was the object of the bill of indictment, and the Prosecutors' addresses to the court, and that it was Germany herself condemned by the judgements passed. It did not occur to the Prosecutors or the judges, or to anyone else, that to decide that 70 million people in a nation of 70 million inhabitants were guilty, was tantamount to saying that those 70 millions were innocent. If the concurrence of world opinion was obtained in such a verdict it would only be by surprise, and in any case, neither ethics nor history could unreservedly approve such a verdict.

Through which cracks in the wall of closed minds ethics and history opened a triumphal path will, without fail, be argued some day. Neither the materiality, nor the fact that they were produced under the pressure of political necessity, will ever be contested of two of them: Russia and Israel.

In fact it is Russia who gave the first blow of the pick-axe to the legal edifice so laboriously constructed at Nuremberg. In order to better justify her policy of isolating West Germany, she said that it was a den of Nazi nostalgics, of traditionally impenitent militarists, and of revenge seekers, at the disposal of the Americans. In order to profit by a show of contrast, she lifted the burden of guilt from the 18 to 20 millions of East Germans, by saying that they had [47] simply acted without judgement, that is, that they were innocent. It is clear that by the same kind of reasoning the West Germans could, in turn, become 50 to 52 million innocent people, and that by conceding that a sense of conscience is not noticeably more developed in the leaders of people than in the people themselves – hardly disputable - even those who were hanged at Nuremberg would be no exception to this general formula for innocence.

Let us have no illusions. Those who come after us will surely decide that this is so. Even now, no one believes any longer that if the Nuremberg Trial were held over again the accused would be hanged. In his Nuremberg Diary, Dr. Gilbert, who was the "Psychologist" of the trial and spent a year studying the accused in their prison, and who, in that capacity, testified at the Eichmann trial in Jerusalem, describes them as in no way differing from the mass of ordinary people encountered on any street, at all levels of the social hierarchy. And he asserts that what

happened in Germany could happen anywhere, that human nature could, in certain circumstances, furnish other examples of the acts of which they were accused. It could not be better put. A crime which can be committed by anyone anywhere, for which only human nature and circumstances are responsible, is not a crime. Or else we are all assassins and our judge is not among us.

The case of Israel is hardly different from that of Russia. Massed at the foot of a world-sized wailing wall, day and night for fifteen years, Zionists from all over the world - all Israelis are not, happily, Zionists - have cried unceasingly, every day more gruesomely, every day more agonisingly. The purpose is to publicise what they consider the true and apocalyptic proportions of the horror and the tortures the Jewish world suffered from Nazism, and thereby to increase the amount of reparations which the State of Israel receives from Germany.

This is a sordid affair of money. In 1956, when it was clear that the world was refusing to fall into step with the international Zionist movement in this enterprise, to make Germany an everlasting milk cow for Israel, a book by a certain Alex Weissberg called *L'Histoire de Joël Brand*, with the subtitle, *Un troc monstrueux, un million de Juifs pour dix mille camions* (The monstrous barter: 1 million Jews for 10,000 trucks) was published, which, in the light of paragraph c) of the definition of crime in the Nuremberg Charter, was a veritable bill of indictment against Britain and the United States, rightly considered by the Zionist movement as responsible for the failure of the enterprise. The blackmail was obvious. It was based, nonetheless, on solid grounds. Britain and the United States were untroubled.

Roughly, this was the theme: because she had opposed, even after 1933, the emigration of European Jews to Israel through application of the Balfour Declaration, more particularly because she had, in December 1938, politely got rid of Dr. Schacht who had been sent by Hitler to London to propose their transportation [48] en masse to Palestine, Britain should be declared co-responsible for their massacre. And all the more so because in 1944 she wrecked a proposal of Himmler's which would have opened the door to safety for a million Jews. The United States was responsible because they had in every case supported Britain's actions. France, too, was included, although more discreetly - in 1940-41 she had blocked a plan to transport all the European Jews to Madagascar.

The enterprise which hung fire in 1956 was renewed in 1961 during the Eichmann trial, and in such terms that many people were led to question whether this was not one of the principal objects of this trial. Two things were announced to take place together: 1) Joël Brand, the principal actor surviving the deal to exchange 10,000 trucks for one million Jews, appeared on the witness stand, with hitherto unpublished documents of conversations concerning that deal, which amounted, in fact, to a violent indictment of Britain and the United States, 2) and a private trip that M. Ben Gurion was to take incognito "to France and to Canada, a trip he would take advantage of to pay an official visit to London, from Paris, and to Washington from Ottawa." (Newspapers, May 24th)

At that time, the pretence in the plan was pointed out. Rather than Paris and Ottawa, were not London and Washington the real destination of M. Ben Gurion's trip, where he wanted to make a bargain for his silence?

Britain and the United States were no more troubled than they were in 1956. M. Ben Gurion was invited neither to London nor to Washington, nor was the snub overlooked.

On the stand before the Jerusalem Tribunal, Joël Brand unwrapped his package on the 29th and 30th of May. The Prosecutor raised the bid, and, so as not to create any jealousy, brought Russia in too, a propos of a bombardment of the Auschwitz "gas chambers" which the Jewish leaders in Palestine in 1944 had requested, and which Russia, too, lining up with Britain and the United States, had said was "impossible for technical reasons." How, indeed, could the gas chambers be destroyed by aerial bombardment without annihilating at the same time many if not most of the prisoners in the camp, Jewish for the most part?

This sort of argument, moreover, offers no loophole. Had the Allies deferred to the request of the Jewish leaders in Palestine, they would today be accused of having aided Germany in the extermination of the Jewish people under the fallacious pretext of destroying the

gas chambers, an operation they would have bungled - intentionally their accusers would say - just as they failed in so many other of their objectives throughout the war.

Now we are at this point: while Germany is indirectly cleared through a false step on Russia's part, a wrong move on the part of the international Zionist movement and the State of Israel puts the Allies, the judges, on the bench of the accused with the Germans. We will return to the first of these mis-steps. Of the [49] second, one could deplore the fact that it hinged on blackmail, and that it includes worthless arguments, although on the whole, and with regard to the Nuremberg Charter, it comes to amply justified conclusions. Of both, it can only be said that they are complementary in that they together and perhaps unwittingly reopened the door to the proposition that all the belligerents in all wars are collectively responsible, a view world opinion regarded favourably right after the war of 1914-1918.

However comforting this result may be, it must not make us forget that this idea of the responsibility of the Allies was circulated by Israel and the Zionist movement only in connection with crimes against humanity (paragraph c. of Art. 6 of the Charter), Germany remaining solely responsible with regard to paragraphs a. (crimes and plots against the peace) and b. (war crimes).

If it is also possible to apply these other two paragraphs to the conduct of the Allies during and before the war, it is on the answer to this question that the historians verdict depends.

An examination of the indictment of crimes and plots against the peace will revive in its pitiless materiality the whole chain of events from 1919 to 1939.

Chapter III

CONSPIRACY AND CRIMES AGAINST PEACE

As defined in paragraph (a) of Article 6 of the Nuremberg Charter, crimes against the peace were concerned either with, aggravation or participating in a conspiracy with the intention of perpetrating such acts of aggravation. As has been pointed out, premeditation had to be established.

This is roughly the way the indictment went, on this point: in the course of 1920, a number of not very respectable individuals, scattered all over Germany, arranged to meet at various places, principally in Munich, where they formed an association of malefactors whose purpose was to launch aggressive warfare against neighbouring states. Hitler became the head of this association in 1921. They must have been fairly astute, since they managed to give this association the baptismal name N.S.D.A.P. (*National Sozialistische Deutsche Arbeiter Partei*), and the appearance of a political party. They must have been fairly intelligent, too, since they understood that in order to launch aggressive warfare against neighbouring states, it had absolutely to be done in the name of Germany, which seemed to indicate that they must first seize power. Hence, the conspiracy against peace - which in more modern and more diplomatic language would be called conspiracy against collective security - was in addition found to be tied in with conspiracy against the internal security of a state. As for premeditation, that had been in the air for nearly twenty years. It must be conceded that rarely have criminals had so much time at their disposal, to take stock of their crime, and thus to become more guilty.

Taking things in chronological order, the Tribunal first had to pass judgement on the conditions under which the accused had seized, consolidated and maintained power, the methods used, particularly subversion by terrorism, the domestic doctrine that was applied, etc.

I would like to be clearly understood. I, too, condemn National Socialism, Fascism, Bolshevism, and in general all doctrines that, on the pretext of arousing a revolutionary spirit, preach insurrection and the seizure of power, by means of subversion by terrorism, doctrines to which, after success has been achieved in a blood bath, their followers are held fast by more or less open, and always ferocious, repression. But my purely philosophical censure is separated by a gulf from the condemnation of legal authority. I disapprove of their conception of life and their methods, but I also disapprove of the use of coercion against National Socialism, Bolshevism, Fascism, etc. to prevent them from expressing themselves, or to send them to the gallows, if by chance they lose the play-off in a tied match. In the name of that special liberty which belonged only to those who had won it, St. Just [51] killed the French Revolution. Freedom belongs to everyone, even to those who fight against it. All these disoriented people are, furthermore, only the product of disoriented societies, whether it is a question of Spartacus or Hitler, Mussolini or Castro, Lenin or Franco. To call the one lot criminals and the other benefactors is only a political viewpoint, and will not stand up under examination. It is the same sociological problem for all, in that all are morally or philosophically culpable; they are all

juridically innocent, which cannot be said of the social structures themselves, which are all morally, philosophically and juridically culpable. As long as there are societies which oppress, there will be rebels to resist with violence, and - alas! - many more rebels who are taken for revolutionaries, than there are true revolutionaries. Therefore, it is societies which must be attacked, not men. The guillotine, according to the wisdom of the ancients, can eliminate the criminal, but not the crime; nothing could be truer.

But these considerations are only subjective. In all objectivity it can rightly be claimed that among the judges one at least was not qualified to condemn the origins, ideas and methods of National Socialism, because his own origins, ideas and methods were in every point similar to those of National Socialism, and his place should have been on the bench of the accused, not that of the judges. And as for the others, they were hardly better qualified, since in their origins, ideas and methods they did not refuse to deal with that 'association of malefactors'; until 1939 its ambassadors and other emissaries were recognised and respected in all the capitals of the world and therefore in their own, and it had a place at Geneva in the League of Nations. It was even politely regretted when the 'association' departed slamming the door. And since then, what were they all busy with? Since when has International Law been entitled to sanction a government which a people, in one way or another, makes for itself, or to which it submits, beyond the right granted to the government of other peoples to recognise it or not, to maintain or not to maintain relations with it? Strictly speaking, one could understand if this had happened to the German people, because it is traditional for a victorious insurrection to massacre the representatives of the power it has overthrown or, the other way round, that the existing power massacres the leaders of an insurrection that failed. But for a Tribunal, international besides, not elected (except by force of arms and by itself), to declare itself qualified passes all understanding. So far as I know there never has been and never will be, I hope, any question of shouldering arms to free the Russians from Kruschew, the Cubans from Castro, or the Spaniards from Franco. We are no longer in the era of Metternich and the Congress of Vienna, and the Holy Alliance.

As for the seizure of power by subversion, the methods by which the accused were charged could not be compared with those employed by Kruschew in Hungary, Fidel Castro in Cuba, or [52] Franco in Spain. If it was actually a question of subversion by insurrectional violence up to November 8th, 1923 (the date of the Munich putsch that did not come off), from that date on the N.S.D.A.P. no longer considered taking over power except by constitutional and legal means. There is no question that its propaganda retained a certain violent character, that all the public meetings were conducted with the protection of its own police force (S.A. - *Stürmabteilung*, security service, then S.S. - *Schutztaffel*, elite security service), nor that these S.A. and S.S. were not armed to the teeth and had quick reflexes and a heavy hand. But it must also be taken into account that the actions of the N.S.D.A.P. were in response to the communists' threat to put a stop to the meetings with violence, and to achieve this by sending in elements just as heavily armed, just as quick in reflex and just as heavy-handed. On them, in addition, lay the responsibility for provocation.

With this exception, for which its adversaries were responsible, the N.S.D.A.P. pursued the conquest of power by those methods employed by all parties in all countries where party activity is free, that is, by means of elections. I do not deny that there was still a question of subversion. In my opinion, in all the democracies in the world, those who carry the elections are those who have the money, and are best able to- subvert public opinion through the written and spoken press, that is, the ones who can buy the greatest number of papers. This was not the case with the N.S.D.A.P. before 1930, and until then the election results were not brilliant. But, from 1930 on, once heavy industry had sided with them, everything changed, as can be seen by the German Reichstag election tables, 1924 to 1933 (compare the votes

Obtained by the N.S.D.A.P. with the number of unemployed at the time of voting):

1. From 1924 to 1930

Dates	Votes won	%	Seats	Unemployed
May 4th, 1924	1,918,000	6.6	32	320,711

December 7th, 1924	908000	3.0	14	282,645
May 20th, 1926	810:006	2.6	12	268,443

II. From 1939 to 1933

Dates	Votes won	%	Seats	Unemployed
September 14th, 1930	6,407,000	18.3	107	1,061,570
July 31st, 1932	13,779,000	37.3	230	5,392,248
November 6th, 1932	11,737,000	33.1	196	5,355,428
March 5th, 1933	17,265,800	43.7	288	5,598,855

Heavy industry was just as worried by the mounting unemployment as the working class. Contemporary economists generally agree that when the percentage of unemployed exceeds 5% of the active population, there is a danger of social disorders. Precisely at the beginning of 1930 this margin of tolerance was not only reached but passed. Furthermore, the consequences of the Wall Street crash, which were beginning to be felt in Europe, gave a [53] disturbing indication that this rate was rising. Finally, after the fall of the German Mark, heavy industry attributed the collapse to the government parties, and registered their inability to correct the situation. In a word, they had no other card to play but National Socialism, and they played it, cautiously at first, behind the scenes, and then openly. That explains the reversal of the electoral trend after the ballot of September 14th, 1930.

In the second half of 1932, when the two dissolutions that brought about the balloting of July 31st and November 6th had shown that the possibility no longer existed of finding in the Reichstag a majority of the kind of the earlier parliamentary coalitions, the national parties (Centre Party and Catholic Bavarian party), whose leaders were respectively Hugenberg and von Papen, turned to the N.S.D.A.P. - the first just for a short time and the second for good. Thus it was that on January 30th., 1933, Hitler was appointed Reich Chancellor by old Marshal Hindenburg, then President of the Republic. (In similar circumstances, President Coty appointed General de Gaulle Prime Minister on June 30th, 1958). In the elections which took place the following March 5th, the Hitler-Papen tandem was triumphant: 288 seats for the first, 52 for the second, or a total of 340 out of the 648 seats of the Reichstag, thus an assured majority of 16 in the electoral body, 52% of the vote.

Up to this point everything took place in conformity with pure democratic tradition, as it is understood by democrats today.

If there was conspiracy the number of accomplices is impressive and it would be a mistake to think that they were all German. We know, as I have just said, that the accession to power of the N.S.D.A.P. was financially, and very substantially, assisted by German heavy industry. This aid came from the Central Propaganda Treasury, whose distributors were the banker Schroeder, and Hugenberg. Now, when the German Mark began to depreciate during the Weimar Republic, almost all the industries which contributed to that fund were subsidised by British or American banks or trust companies. For example, the American chemical consortium Dupont de Nemours, and the English trust Imperial Chemical Industry, subsidised I.G. Farben, with whom they shared the world explosives market, and the Dillon Bank of New York subsidised the *Vereinigte Stahlwerke*, a German steel trust. Others were subsidised by Morgan or Rockefeller, etc. Thus, the Pound and the Dollar were part of the conspiracy which brought Hitler to power. But no one has heard that the Dupont de Nemours, the Dillons, Morgans, Rockefellers, etc. were summoned to appear as accomplices before the Nuremberg Tribunal.

At the time when this conspiracy was directed against collective security, that 'association of malefactors' did not lack for political aid and abetment from outside; Britain in the matter of rearmament (naval agreement of June 18th, 1935), Russia in the matter of aggression (German-Soviet pact and the partition of [54] Poland), even France, if you take into consideration, *a propos* of Munich, the condemning of pre-war governments by post-war governments. But, for all that, there was no question of having them leave the judges' bench for that of the defendants.

Here we touch on the heart of the problem of crime against peace. This is described in Article 6, paragraph a. of the Indictment as follows:

The aims and purposes of the Nazi Party and of the defendants and divers other persons from time to time associated as leaders, members, supporters or adherents of the Nazi Party (hereinafter called collectively the "Nazi conspirators") were, or came to be, to accomplish the following by any means deemed opportune, including unlawful means, and contemplating ultimate resort to threat of force, force and aggressive war:

1. To abrogate and overthrow the Treaty of Versailles and its restrictions upon the military armament and activity of Germany;

2. To acquire the territories lost by Germany as the result of the World War of 1914-18 and other territories in Europe asserted by the Nazi conspirators to be occupied principally by so-called "racial Germans";

3. To acquire still further territories in continental Europe and elsewhere claimed by the Nazi conspirators to be required by the "racial Germans" as "*Lebensraum*" or living space...

The first point was aimed at Germany's secret rearmament from 1933 to 1935, after that carried on openly; her departure from the League of Nations on October 14th, 1933; the decision to build up a military air force, March 10th, 1935; compulsory military service restored on the 16th of the same month, with a peace-time strength fixed at 500,000 men; the re-occupation of the Rhineland on March 7th, 1936.

The second point was aimed principally at Silesia, divided up among the tiny artificial states created by the Treaties of Versailles and Saint Germain, the Danzig corridor, Teschen, Malmédy, etc. It might have included the Saar, too, if the Saar had not almost unanimously voted by plebiscite, on January 13th, 1935, to return to Germany.

As for the third point, which embraced all the territories conquered by the German armies in operations against Poland, Russia, Norway, Denmark, Luxembourg, Belgium, the Netherlands, Greece, Yugoslavia, etc., which should have been dealt with in peace treaties, once the war was over, it stated precisely how the responsibility for everything that had happened fell solely on Germany:

"(Their) aims and purposes were not fixed or static but evolved and expanded as they acquired progressively greater power and became able to make more effective application of threats of force and threats of aggressive war. When their expanding aims and purposes became finally so great as to provoke such strength of resistance as could be overthrown by armed force and aggressive [55] war, and not simply by the opportunistic methods theretofore used, such as fraud, deceit, threats, intimidation, fifth column activities, and propaganda, the Nazi conspirators deliberately planned, determined upon, and launched their aggressive wars and wars in violation of international treaties, agreements..."

The Tribunal acceded to these conclusions arrived at by the prosecution, and recorded them as justified in the judgement rendered (Volume 1, pp. 184 ff). It appeared clear to them, from the documents produced from the beginning, that there really had a conspiracy hatched by the Germans in 1920, with the intention of committing these crimes, of which they were accused, and that they had committed them deliberately and in full knowledge. The most important among these documents were: the programme of the N.S.D.A.P. made public in Munich on February 25th, 1920 (in 25 points, of which the first three were considered particularly incriminating); a number of extracts, out of context, from the speeches of Hitler to the Reichstag, in the Sportpalast, or in other public places; a number of the same person's talks to the General Staff, in particular that of November 5th, 1937 (Hossbach document, P.S. 386, original Volume XXXVII, pp. 546 and 556, and in French, Volume II, pp. 281-288), and on August 22nd, 1939, for which three contradictory documents existed. The two most contradictory were retained by the Tribunal (P.S. 798, Volume XXVI, pp. 338-344, and P.S. 1014, Volume XXVI, pp. 523-524).

And now I would like to call attention to something all these documents had in common: the distortions made of them which disappeared in the translations and which formed the basis - the distortions, not the texts themselves! - of the argument maintained by the Prosecution and upheld by the court.

For example, point 1 of the N.S.D.A.P. programme of February 20th, 1920, reads: "Wir fordern den Zusammenschluss aller Deutschen auf Grund des Selbstbestimmungsrechtes der Voelker zu einen Gross-Deutschland." (We demand the union of all Germans on the basis of the right of self-determination of peoples into a Greater Germany.) Used at the trial, we find the following translation: "*Nous demandons la réunion de tous les Allemands dans la 'Plus Grande Allemagne' en accord avec le principe du droit des peuples à disposer d'eux-mêmes.*" (We demand the reunion of all Germans into the "Greater Germany" in accordance with the principle of the right of self-determination of peoples.) One is obliged to see that by putting quotation marks around the words "Greater Germany" where none existed in the original a change which alters the meaning of the text has been made.

The same holds for point 3, where the original reads: "*Wir fordern Land und Boden (Kolonien) zur Ernaehrung unseres Volkes und Ansiedlung unseres Bevölkerungsüberschusses,*" (We demand land and soil (colonies) for the nourishment of our people and the settlement of our excess population).

[56]

"*Nous demandons de la terre et des territoires pour nourrir notre peuple et la possibilité d'employer à la colonisation l'excédent de notre population.*" (Volume II, p. 185). (We demand land and territories for the nourishment of our people, and the possibility to employ our excess population in colonisation). Here the suppression of the parentheses and the word between them shifted the main point of the article to second importance, namely the colonies.

The same thing again with the Hossbach document, a series of conjectures written in the hypothetical conditional mood, but translated as a series of statements in the present tense, from which it was deduced at Nuremberg that Hitler had already decided by November 5th, 1937, as head of the government, to resort to that war which he (according to the indictment), as head of the party, had decided on back in 1920, as the only way to resolve the German problem.

The Hossbach document was considered most accusatory because of this sentence: "*La question allemande ne pourrait être résolue que par la force, laquelle ne va jamais sans risques.*" (The German problem may not be resolved except by force, which is always attended by risks) which was translated as "*La question allemande ne PEUT être résolue, etc.*" (The German problem can only be solved by, etc.) At the time all politicians everywhere, with a few exceptions, formed the same opinion, "the only way to stop Germany from realising her objectives is with force." This was an application of the famous Roman adage, *Si vis pacem para bellum* (If you wish for peace, prepare for war), which was and still is the rule all over the world, witness General de Gaulle's New Year Message to the French troops on January 1st, 1962. "Prepare yourselves," he said, "prepare yourselves for great warrior actions which may be imposed upon the nation, and her European allies. That the destiny of France is linked with her military power has never been more true." This is a good deal more specific than the words the Hossbach paper puts into Hitler's mouth as he addresses his military commanders. Should we conclude that if this war for which they are to be prepared could not be averted, and should end in another Nuremberg, the General would be hanged? And if one day war breaks out between the U.S.A. and Russia (a war which, like the war of 1939-45, could not fail at once to become a World War) will Kruschew's famous speech to the U.S. in 1961 be remembered when, striking at his desk with his shoe, he threatened the United States with complete destruction?

It should be further clearly stated that, the following year, when it became a question of translating into action the first of the eventualities hypothesised in the Hossbach document (Czechoslovakia), Keitel's directive determining the preparatory steps to be taken, specified on December 17th, 1938, "Externally it must be very clear that it is only a question of a peaceful action, and not of a military operation." (Not retained at Nuremberg by [57] the Prosecution or the court.)

We have an explanation of the interpretation of the text of the Hossbach document, given by W. L. Shirer - unless it was given by the French translator, since it does not appear in the

German edition - in a footnote to p. 333 (p. 305, American edition) in his book *The Rise and Fall of the Third Reich*.

"Almost all the German records of the remarks of Hitler and of others in private talks were written down in the third person as indirect discourse, though frequently they abruptly slipped into direct, first-person discourse without any change of punctuation. This question posed a problem for American English.

"Because I wanted to preserve the accuracy of the original document and the exact wording used or recorded, I decided it was best to refrain from tampering with these accounts by rendering them into first-person direct discourse or by excluding them from within quotation marks. In the latter case it would have looked as though I were indulging in liberal paraphrasing when I was not.

"It is largely a matter in the German records of verb tenses being changed by the actual recorders from present to past and of changing the first-person pronoun to third-person. If this is borne in mind there will not be, I believe, any confusion. "

It was Hossbach, the recorder of the report, who used the wrong tense, as Mr. Shirer knows better than anyone else. The prosecutors and the judges knew it too. I think falsification could hardly be more ingenuously confessed. Thus, at least on this point, the defendants were condemned on the basis of what Hitler was supposed to have said, not on what he did say. If they knew that their report was in addition in no way official, that it was written down on the 10th of November 1937, five days later, from notes hastily taken on the 5th, that it was not read over by the person concerned, nor brought to anyone's attention (Volume XIV, p. 40) the historian and judge of the future will certainly be startled. And the same holds for the Schmundt document.

One last comment *a propos* of this document. On May 16th, 1946, Dr. Siemers, counsel for Admiral Raeder, cast a doubt on the authenticity of the document because it was not labelled "State Secret" (Volume XIV, p. 40). A written deposition was requested of the author, who had been located, but not his appearance in court; that would have been too dangerous. On the 18th of May, 1946, he said that he could not guarantee that the text presented to the Tribunal was an exact copy of his notes (Volume XLII, pp. 228-230).

The case of documents P.S. 798 and 1014 is even more typical. On August 22nd, 1939, Hitler gave a talk to his military leaders which, it is very likely, no one was asked to type out. But, on November 26th, 1945, the Prosecution preserved three versions of the talk, all of which were claimed to be authentic (probably they had not been read) even though they were obviously in [58] contradiction to each other. Moreover, not one of them had been communicated to the Defence beforehand, as required by the Charter, although all three had been released to the press. At the end of the reading of the second version the Defence objected, arguing first that procedure had been violated, second that it was not possible to put in evidence two contradictory documents concerning the same event. The objection was overruled. However, the third version was dropped. And until May 16th, 1946, for nearly seven months, the Prosecution maintained its general thesis, leaning, to the applause of the international press, first on one version and then on the other. Each time the Defence naturally wanted to object, and each time it was cut short.

Finally on May 16th, 1946, Dr. Siemers, counsel for Raeder, who was implicated in both documents, became angry. He was not, however, being difficult since he was quite willing to have one document accepted, but not both. Nothing could be more logical.

The President saw that this time he would not desist. "What are your reasons?" he finally asked.

Dr. Siemers: "...this document (he was speaking of the more vulnerable, P.S. 1014) is nothing but two pieces of paper headed "Second Speech by the Führer, on 22 August, 1939." The original is without a heading, has no file number, no diary number, no stamp 'secret', no signature, no date... On all the documents which the Prosecutor has submitted, even in the case of minutes, you will find the date of the meeting, that of the drafting of the minutes, the place where the minutes were typed, the name of the person who typed them, a stamp 'secret', or some other. Furthermore, Hitler certainly talked for two and a half hours. I believe it is also

generally known that Hitler spoke very fast. It is out of the question that the minutes could be only 1,5 pages long if they are to give the meaning and content of a speech which lasted 2 and 1/4 hours. Later, I will submit the original of document P.S. 798. I am not an expert on handwriting or typewriters, but it is plain to see that this document, which bears no signature and whose origin we do not know, was written on the same kind of paper and with the same typewriter." (Volume XIV, p. 51).

A long discussion began. It will suffice to give the argument of the Prosecution presented by Thomas J. Dodd, American Trial Counsel who, after having said that he would make an effort "to find out where this document came from, that all that he knew was that it had been captured in the German archives, and, as such, was to be admitted," concluded:

"...whether true or not, it is a question of weight. On my respectful submission, we cannot go into intrinsic comparisons in order to decide the admissibility of the document. We would have a great deal to do if we compared the documents in detail. It is a question we do not have to discuss." (Volume XIV, p. 53).

A last objection by the Defence, then the President: "Yes, very well. The request to strike out the minutes of document P.S. 1014 [59] is denied."

One document was as false as the other, and if the Tribunal had admitted it about the second, given what Dr. Siemers said, they would have had to admit it about the first. They did not fall into the trap. There was another reason for having the second document admitted, in spite of the flagrant contradiction, and that was that it contained three important sentences, not found in the first: "Destruction of Poland, main objective. Aim: elimination of vital forces, not an attempt to arrive at a certain line... close your hearts to pity, adopt a brutal attitude I am only afraid that at the last minute some swine will propose an arbitration plan."

In his anxiety, the falsifier had simply overdone it. Doubtless he had observed, when it was done, that he had been too modest in the first document and wanted to make up for it in the second. And in his zeal he did not notice that the second contradicted the first.

We would never finish if we tried to cite the distortions and the forgeries. We will see further on, in the chapter on "Crimes against Humanity", that M. Edgar Faure broke all records with the report, duly dated and signed (by someone dead, of course) of an anti-Jewish congress which took place at Krumheubel on April 3rd and 4th, 1944, and which was proved, before a full court on April 2nd, 1946 (Volume X, p. 420), never to have taken place'

I would like to add this concerning warped documents. One day when he was having a little vacation from the trial in Paris, a former friend, a journalist representing one of the big Paris newspapers at Nuremberg, told me how surprised he was at the attitude of the defendants. "It's funny," he said, "the texts are read to them in their own language, and naturally they understand them. Then when the arguments against them in the texts are taken up one by one, they act as if they no longer understood, and their counsels even more so. You say they do not understand... and I say. 'bosh!'"

Just reading these documents, which were not made public at the time, explains everything. If one spoke of them in *Grande Allemagne* and then argued *Plus Grande Allemagne*, or of Colonies to argue Silesia or Poland or the Ukraine, or if a text was read to them in the conditional tense and then arguments were drawn from it in the present, how could they understand?

This process of reading to the German defendants a text written in their mother tongue asking them to acknowledge it as authentic, then producing English, Russian and French translations which had nothing in common with the original, then taking from these translations arguments which were then re-translated into German, was not without, as I have said, a certain Machiavellianism. Many distortions of texts were corrected by the defendants or their counsel acting together - in a way *in flagrante dilecto* - but there were so many that inevitably several escaped them, and it was their bad luck that they were not the least important.

[60]

Like war crimes, crimes of peace require that we go into the materiality of the facts. Naturally, we will not go into detail any more than we need to give the reader a general picture of the whole, just enough to give him something to think about.

The Lion in the fable of La Fontaine, after he had been hunting with the Heifer, the Nanny and the Ewe, divided up the spoils into four parts and explained to them, if I recall correctly, that the first went to him because he was the King, the second because it was his share, the third because he was the strongest, and as to the fourth, he would at once throttle anyone making a claim to it. It did not occur to the writer of the fable to assemble a Court of Justice to condemn this marked breach of the laws and customs of hunting. If he had, he would have found some jurist Fox to claim that there was an infringement, that this infringement constituted *one* hunting crime, and surely not *four*. For the jurist Fox as for the defendant Lion, the fraudulent division into four parts of the spoils of the hunt, in this case the Deer, left one, the body of the crime, and also only *one* infringement (in this case the right of the strongest) analysed and redivided under only four explanatory headings.

To claim that this destruction of the Versailles Treaty, the rearmament of Germany, the acquisition of territories lost as a result of the First World War, and the acquisitions of others for expansion, coupled with the deliberate intention of making aggressive wars, added up to so many counts of indictment was perhaps an ingenious idea. If it had not been for the overcrowded and overcharged atmosphere in which the trial took place - that extraordinary proliferation of fish-wives, stocking knitters and the like who invaded that improvised court, and who fed the interest of the lowest and highest - even the least informed spectator would quickly have grasped that if crime existed, buried under this mass of headings, there was in reality only one, the destruction of the Versailles Treaty, or the right of the strongest of the fable.

To continue the analogy of the fable: imagine that the democratic Heifer, Nanny and Ewe, having been joined by a Jenny just for the sake of being represented, a Turkey because every farce has a fool, a Fox for the scenery, and a Wolf for the moral, have managed to catch the Lion in a snare, firmly tied to the ground, and that they put him to death little by little, taking care to prolong the spectacle, all of them gathering round every day so as to miss nothing - we would have a League of Nations of animals, in which a Monkey all bedecked could well play the part of the mace-bearer, and the press could be represented by an old cackling hen. Imagine?.. this place in the concert of nations, this Lion in a snare - did not the Treaty of Versailles want to condemn Germany to just about exactly that? One day, maggot-ridden and half dead, the Lion managed to break his leash, that is all. As in the world of La Fontaine, an English Rat, or an American, if not one of their interbreeding, came out of his hole [61] at the right moment and gnawed through the rope at just the right spot.

To return to the world of men, the question which presents itself is whether the German Lion had the right to break out of the snare, and this question on another level is that of the sacredness of treaties, especially peace treaties.

A treaty does not necessarily have to be the written expression of a relation of forces, e.g. a customs conventions, the European Common Market. In the case of the European Common Market it must be admitted that it was imposed on the Six by an outside danger that threatened all of them and that Germany, although deriving little advantage from this agreement, nonetheless was forced into it by the new situation in the world in which she found herself as a result of World War II, and because Britain's non-cooperation would be tantamount to her exclusion from the most important markets on the Continent. There are relations of forces that are purely economic. In the beginning they are all of this character, which they retain as long as the problems inherent in commerce and the conquest of markets can be solved peaceably, and merchants do not request the State to send soldiers to help them to keep what they have, or to acquire a market prohibited to them, or that they have lost in price competition. Contingent on these conditions, treaties which are made or dissolved peaceably are quite imaginable and, insofar as the interests involved are only of relative importance, they are fairly common. It is remarkable that on that score no jurist has thought of invoking the argument of Eternal Inviolability.

The same does not hold for peace treaties, since they are always the written expression of relations of military forces, in that there is always a conqueror who imposes his will on the vanquished, who in turn submits only with the knife at his throat. Ceaselessly and eternally denounced in the name of Ethics, the process has never been codified in the name of Law, in the sense of the limitation of the rights of the conqueror and the protection of the inalienable rights of the vanquished.

Until the beginning of this century, the tradition of ages has been that the superior interests of State were reasons enough for declaring war, and no moral or judicial justification was necessary. The savagery of the fighting was limited only by the stage of invention in the art of destruction at the time. One ransomed oneself or was ransomed at the discretion of the conqueror, depending on how the battle had turned out. White flags, truces, treaties... from the declaration of war to the conclusion of peace, everything unfolded according to a kind of code, honour handed down from chivalry. There was always a traitorous knight, who was of course always the enemy. After the signing of the peace, which ended the war, the adversaries separated according to convention, shook each other ceremoniously by the hand, the loser accepting the conditions of the victor, wrapping himself in [62] his dignity, and both promising to see each other again some day. The Franco-Prussian War of 1870-71 was declared and conducted, and peace was concluded in that style. And even though in the meantime many attempts had been made, especially at The Hague, to give war a code, drawn up by jurists and not by men of the sword, so, too, was the war of 1914-1918, at least in its preparation and declaration. Germany did nothing at Frankfurt to hinder the policy of revenge openly carried on by Poincaré - unquestionably a war criminal in the terms of the Nuremberg Charter! - but she took umbrage in an untraditional way, by threatening to reply with more of the same. And she declared herself ready, if necessary, to pick up the gauntlet which for many years had been daily thrown at her. The intangibility of treaties was not an article of Law, but an established fact which, in spite of international conventions, it was admitted on both sides could only last until wars changed it. Just as Poincaré proclaimed that the Frankfurt treaty was a disgrace for France, and that it should be destroyed by force of arms, so it was in Germany, where Bethmann-Hollweg allegedly called all the other treaties that bound them in Central and Balkan Europe, in Africa and the Near East, "scraps of paper." The phrase went around the world in the press and even in schools and universities. In reality, Bethmann-Hollweg had only said "a bit of paper." (Renouvin)

In order to decide whether these examples are exceptions which permit no generalisations, or on the contrary are case-types on which rules can be based, the reader can ask himself what public opinion today would think of jurists who proclaimed as sacrosanct the following: the treaty of Verdun (843, partition of Charlemagne's empire), the treaty of Cateau-Cambrésis (1559, end of the Italian wars, and the cleaning up of the unhappy after effects of the Hundred Years War, which had come to an end in 1453 without any treaty other than the Treaty of Troyes of 1429, from which the King of England derived the title of King of France, still part of the realm of England at the end of the past century), the treaty of Westphalia (1648, end of the Thirty Years War), the treaty of Vienna (1814-15, end of the Napoleonic Wars) etc. But, in fact, there is no middle way. If the inviolability of treaties is a law, all treaties are inviolable without exception, each treaty being the negation of the inviolability of the preceding one. It is a fact that while the jurists at Nuremberg were talking about the sacredness of treaties, they really had in mind a general rule for which the Treaty of Versailles served as the only basis and only application. But why Versailles rather than Frankfurt, or Frankfurt rather than Vienna or Verdun?

It is clear that the argument of the inviolability of the single Versailles Treaty is without moral, historic or legal grounds, that it rests solely on the chances of war, and that if the war had been won by the losers, things would be reversed and no fewer or less well qualified jurists would be upholding the opposite argument.

[63]

On the other hand, it is fairly elastic, taking into account the fact that in the matter of monetary sanctions, the same judges did not consider the Treaty inviolable since, from 1919 to

1930, the considerable indemnities which Germany was sentenced to pay ranged, with their acquiescence, from 132 billion gold Marks⁴ to a sum close to zero; and in its territorial clauses it was only in the case of Germany that it was inviolable, since today all those clauses have been annulled - with new and appreciable aggravations - to the profit of Russia.

I have already said that Britain, with the backing of the United States, never considered the military clauses inviolable, not even under Hitler (Naval Agreement of June 1935). As for Russia, until September 18th, 1934 when she was admitted to the League at Litvinov's request and on the recommendation of M. Yvon Delbos and M. Barthou, the Versailles Treaty was in Russian eyes a "dictate of hate and plunder" and the League itself a "League of Bandits." On April 17th, 1922, acting on this main idea, she even signed the Rapallo Treaty with Germany (completed by the first German-Soviet non-aggression pact, April 24th, 1926), the first act of her then foreign policy which was to gather into one bloc all the defeated countries of the war of 1914-1918 who were oppressed by the "dictate of the bandit conquerors." By which it can be seen that in the view of at least three of the judges at Nuremberg this elastic inviolability of the Treaty of Versailles was also in eclipse.

So, if I now conclude that no treaty can be considered sacred, I do not think I can be accused of saying so improperly. Up until Versailles, treaties were not inviolable because they were the expression of relations of force, which are not immutable. Each moment of history has its own possibility of an outburst of violence which sweeps away the treaty which a preceding outburst of violence has produced. It is a vicious circle. As with all vicious circles you cannot escape from it without breaking it, and perhaps now is the time to survey the attempts that have been made in this direction. And it will be seen that the Treaty of Versailles and the Nuremberg Trial have been placed in a quite curious and original context.

At the end of the 19th and beginning of the 20th centuries Intellectual circles were seized with a fit of conscience over war. This reached the workers and public opinion generally and caused the leading persons of nearly all countries to envisage a humanisation of war which would lead progressively to its being outlawed. The conventions adopted at the international conferences at The Hague in 1899 and 1907 should be viewed as materialisations of that fit of conscience. A paradox: it was not France that boasted [64] of having originated all the generous ideas, but Tsarist Russia which took the initiative in this movement in 1899; and in 1907, once again it was not France but the United States which took it up. France was busy preparing her revenge for Frankfurt, and she threw herself into that body and soul, while at the same time she participated in the conferences and the decisions made there. Another paradox: during all this period, as public opinion favoured these conferences more and more (27 participants in 1899, 44 in 1907), and specific measures putting a limitation on recourse to war which tended to eliminate or restrict its inhumanity were adopted in the texts, at the same time all the dangers increased, accumulated and ended by making war inevitable in 1914. Many worthy people thought at that time that the real aim in the minds of most of the participants of The Hague conference was to lay a false scent.

In short, there was fighting from August 2nd, 1914 until November 11th, 1918. The Peace Conference opened at Paris on January 19th, 1919 and on June 28th the treaty which put an official end to the war was signed at Versailles. In the memory of warriors such a humiliation had never been inflicted on the loser, and in the memory of jurists never was there such an infringement of the right of self-determination of people - except, of course, in 1945 and after. The military clauses alone were acceptable in that they recognised reciprocity. But for the rest, one cannot compare without a sense of amazement the 132 billion gold Marks, or the 165 billion gold francs⁵ demanded of Germany in reparations, with the 5 billion in the same currency which Germany exacted from France at Frankfurt (and which brought forth screams from Thiers) nor the amputations of territory, the justifications for them, and what happened to them.

⁴. The various publications on the decisions of the Reparations Commission, instituted by the Treaty of Versailles, are not in agreement on this figure. Benoist-Méchin holds to the deviation for 212 billion, in his *Histoire de l'Armée allemande*. The actual figure is 432 billion.

⁵. To give an idea of the enormity: Germany's national wealth was then estimated at 260 billion gold Marks, and that of France at 250 billion gold francs.

Right after the signing of the Versailles Treaty the victors found themselves in this situation. Having gone to war for "law and civilisation", in the spirit created by the Hague conferences, and against the "Might makes Right" formula attributed to Kaiser Wilhelm II and his Chancellor, Bethmann-Hollweg, they could do no better than themselves to apply the latter formula to a beaten Germany. And yet a unique opportunity existed after the war to break the vicious circle, which could not be done before, by ignoring the results achieved by force of arms and making a treaty with clauses to show that, in conformity with the war aims of the Allies, Right made Might. One has only to read the Fourteen Points to see that that is what President Wilson would have liked to see, and it was the only possible way to get out of the vicious circle. And what a lesson the Allies could have taught the world! Instead of that... but I do not wish to say that then the Treaty of Versailles would have been sacrosanct! The law of force having been forever excluded from international life, they had only to [65] modify it from time to time through the instrument of the Permanent Court of Justice instituted at The Hague in 1899, as required by the changing conditions in society, the structures of society being no more stable than the relationships of force.

The Preamble of the Treaty of Versailles, framed by the Pact of the League of Nations and inseparable from it, did contain an article - No. 19 - making provision for its revision in case it ever became decrepit. The many requests for revision which Germany presented from 1920 to 1939 were based on article 19 - the Treaty was indeed decrepit, from the very hour that it was signed! It will be easily understood, I think, that no more could a treaty which was acceptable in feudal times (whether it was the expression of force or of general consent freely given) today serve to govern relations among the great modern nations, than could a treaty, even though accepted with universal consent in 1919, claim to control in its propositions what might become of the world, say, two hundred years later.

No. If treaties are not 'scraps of paper', neither can they ever be sets of unalterable rules in a world that is not unalterable. The only problem is that of their periodic revision and there are two alternatives. The periodic revision will be made by relations of force and by war, or by international conferences of the Hague type.

Once peace was restored it was thought at Geneva that, in the bosom of the League instituted by the Versailles Treaty, those conversations begun at The Hague could be resumed. They led to nothing, precisely because they took place in the presence of both relations of forces and general consent. On the one side there were the former Allies, victors armed to the teeth and therefore in a position to force acceptance of their most unrealistic stands; on the other there was Germany disarmed and without recourse, obliged to bend to the others' wishes like the Lion of La Fontaine in his snare, if a Rat had not opportunely come on the scene.

The situation was untenable, all the more so because it constituted a marked violation on the part of the victors of the Treaty of Versailles, of which the Preamble to the five sections of military articles said: "In view of making possible preparation for a limitation of armaments of all nations, Germany undertakes to observe strictly the military, naval and air clauses hereinafter stipulated."

Germany having kept her promises and disarmed to the limit imposed by the Versailles Treaty, the victors no longer wished to keep theirs - especially France, followed by the others not wishing to be disobliging or interfere with her interests. We have seen that Britain, at least until 1935, saw no objection.

The error - not to call it worse - of the prosecution and judges at Nuremberg was to claim the right to express opinions, as if the Treaty of Versailles had not been the expression of a relation of forces, as if those who drew up the articles had not been the first [66] to break them, as if in Germany the decision to destroy it had not been a reply to the violations initially committed by the victors.

This sort of reply is found in fact in all the phases of German rearmament, imputed to Germany as crimes by the Indictment.

1. October 14th, 1933. Germany leaves the League of Nations. For years Germany discharged the military clauses of the Treaty of Versailles; the Treaty of Locarno (October 16th,

1925) took legal cognisance of the fact, and Marshal Foch confirmed it in 1927 on his return from a tour of inspection in Germany. In spite of that, France refused to fulfil those same clauses incumbent on her and in spite of the objections of Britain and the United States. The League was powerless to bend France, but maintained its hostile attitude to Germany with regard to equality of rights. The disarmament conference came to grief on this problem. The MacDonald Plan for the limitation of armaments (abolition of all offensive weapons, bombers, tanks, heavy artillery etc.) was not accepted by France. On May 18th, 1933, President Roosevelt addressed the heads of state of 44 nations with a message which took up again the MacDonald Plan. On May 17th, Hitler gave a speech to the Reichstag which was an acceptance of the MacDonald Plan. France did not budge, the League was helpless to persuade her, did not even try and insisted on maintaining her stand to refuse equal rights to Germany, whose doctrine was that either France and the other nations keep to the engagements undertaken at Versailles and also disarm, or she would re-arm. When this point of view was not admitted, Germany slammed the door on the League on October 14th, 1933. On November 12th this decision to quit the League was approved by a plebiscite of 95% of the registered voters.

In the House of Commons on October 15th, Lloyd George put the responsibility on France with these words: "For years France has refused to keep her promise to disarm, and since Locarno she has not ceased to increase her armaments year after year." This added a violation of the spirit of Locarno to that of the Treaty of Versailles. And in his book *La France a sauvé l'Europe*, M. Paul Reynaud admits that this attitude on the part of France made her "seem responsible, in the eyes of the world, for the arms race, which was clearly leading to war." (Volume I, p. 294)

2. March 10th-16th, 1935, Germany builds a Military Force, restores compulsory Military Service and brings the Peace-Time strength of the German Army to 500,000. On the 6th of February 1934, the Doumergue government came to power in France. Barthou was the Minister for Foreign Affairs. One of his acts was to reverse the Locarno policy and substitute the encirclement of Germany for it, preparing the way for a rapprochement with Soviet Russia, which he later got admitted into the League of Nations on September 18th. In March 1935, public pronouncements leading to the Franco-Soviet Pact signed the following May 2nd, were in full flow. Stalin declared that France "was [67] entitled to bring her arms to the level of her security needs"; lengthening the term of military service in France, etc., was achieved. Taking cognisance of this breach of the Versailles and Locarno Treaties, Hitler officially repudiated all the military clauses of the Versailles Treaty, decided to create an air fleet and to restore compulsory military service. If the security of France called for action, so did that of Germany, encircled as it was.

It must be observed that while throwing the responsibility on to France - and rightly, that is indisputable - for a state of affairs that continually worsened, Britain (which at Nuremberg accused the Germans of violating the Treaty of Versailles) was at the same time not so very unforgiving, since she had concluded a naval agreement with Germany in June 1935 which notably increased Germany's naval tonnage, both surface and submarine, in comparison with that allowed at Versailles. The creation of an air fleet, the re-establishment of compulsory military service, the increase of the standing military strength were imputed to Germany as crimes, but obviously not the naval re-armament which was, moreover, done without the assent of France. Britain would have to have been accused of complicity and Britain was one of the judges. There were State's pardons - even at Nuremberg!

3. March 7th, 1936. Germany re-occupied "symbolically" the Demilitarised Rhineland. It was a marked infringement of the Treaty of Versailles. It was the logical outcome of what preceded and Germany's reply to the last act, the signing of the Franco-Soviet Pact on May 2nd, 1935. This pact was not ratified by the French parliament until February 27th, 1936. Hitler had expected a reversal. Contrary to his hopes, it was ratified by 353 votes to 164. On February 21st, Hitler had said to Bertrand de Jouvenel who had come to interview him for Paris-Midi:

"You see before you a Germany nine-tenths of whose people have confidence in their leader, and this leader says to you: Let us be friends. Yes, I know what all of you think. You say: Hitler makes declarations of peace to us, but is it in good faith? Is he sincere? Consider! Would it not be ruinous for both our countries we were to tear each other to pieces again on the battlefield?

My personal efforts towards such a rapprochement will always continue, however. In fact, this more than deplorable pact would naturally create a new situation. You are letting yourselves be dragged into a diplomatic game with a power whose sole aim is to sow disorder among the great European nations, a disorder from which she will benefit.

There are in the lives of nations decisive occasions. Today France can, if she will, forever put an end to that 'German peril' which generations of your children learn to fear. You can remove the heavy burden which weighs on the history of France - the opportunity is given to all of you. If you do not seize it, think of your responsibility to your children.

[68]

For fear that this might compromise the vote on which Hitler had placed so much hope - there was little danger that it could - the government intervened with the director of *Paris-Midi* to the effect that the interview which was to have appeared on the 23rd, only came out on February 28th, that is, the day after the vote in Parliament. There was not long to wait for Hitler's answer to the manoeuvre of the French government and the vote of Parliament. On the 7th of March he re-occupied the Rhineland with military forces.

And so it was with all the grievances enumerated against the defendants at Nuremberg in the Indictment, and sustained by the judgement. It was enough to cite those few examples to demonstrate that in the infernal arms race which led to the war, Germany - even Hitler's Germany - was not alone in bearing all responsibility. The judges played as great a part as the accused and, to be more precise, the initial responsibility was incumbent on France because she alone had prevented the Disarmament Conference from reaching conclusions, conclusions which she alone did not want.

It is often asked what was the reason for France's obstinacy in not desiring disarmament. The answer to this question is given in the *Journal officiel de la République française* of March 26th, 1938, which was addressed to the Ministry of National Economy - at the request of Senator Paul Laffont - concerning the quantities of iron ore exported to Germany from France, since 1934, and obtained the following information:

"The amounts of iron ore (No. 204, customs' tariff) exported to Germany during 1934, 1935, 1936 and 1937, are recorded in the following table:

Year	Quantity in metric quintals
1934	17,060,916
1935	58,616,111
1936	77,931,756
1937	71,329,234

One can estimate the loss M. Francois de Wendel and his associates in iron metallurgy, of Meurthe-et-Moselle, would have sustained if France had not furnished Germany the wherewithal for re-arming. To get an exact picture, compare the export figures for the year before Germany decided to re-arm (1934) and the year after (1935).

Jean Gautier-Boissière and Michel Alexandre, from whom I have borrowed this account, conclude: "It will be a consolation to those French soldiers who suffered wounds during the 1939-40 campaign to know that the projectiles that mutilated them were made out of the ore patriotically exported by M. Francois de Wendel and his metallurgical associates of Meurthe-et-Moselle."

M. François de Wendel was a person of considerable influence in French politics between the two wars. On January 11th, 1923, in order to procure for him at a good price the Rhine [69] Westphalian coke indispensable for Lorraine iron, without forcing him to export, M. Poincaré had the Ruhr occupied, on the pretext that a delivery of telegraph poles made by Germany as

part of her reparations was incomplete. When this scheme failed, rather than force him to pay the asked price for German coke, his friend Barthou, who saw eye to eye with him, did not hesitate to torpedo the Disarmament Conference in order to get a good customer, in the person of Germany, for his iron ore.

No one has heard it said that Mr. François de Wendel was cited by the judges at Nuremberg to appear as an accomplice.

Nor has that been heard about the Dupont de Nemours, the directors of the English Imperial Chemical Industry, the Dillon Bank, the Morgans, the Rockefellers etc. who made loans to the German industries, whose propaganda funds fed the N.S.D.A.P.

* * *

To complete the picture we must now return to an event in connection with breaches of the Treaty of Versailles called "Crimes against peace," in Part a. of Article 6, as interpreted by the Indictment: the Anglo-German Naval Agreement of June 1935, for which Britain could certainly have been accused of conspiracy with Nazism, since it was concluded with the Nazi government. On July 17th, 1937 this agreement was re-affirmed, in a sense favourable to Germany. Through this diplomatic instrument, both Britain and Germany increased their naval armament in flagrant violation of the preamble to the military articles of the Treaty of Versailles. France opposed it and the United States did not look favourably upon it, but they both made the best of it and turned a blind eye. As for Russia, she howled at the time that it was a preparation for anti-Soviet aggression. In 1945, the question of this violation, this 'crime against peace', was not brought up against Britain, and in order to avoid having to bring it up against Britain, Germany was granted pardon for the charge... Everything that Germany had done in matters of rearmament up until then was also deemed allowable, for as long as the honeymoon had lasted - until March 1939.

In passing, it may be of interest to examine the proposition that the political rupture between Germany and Britain was produced not in March 1939, but during 1936, and that the first step was taken not by the British, but by Hitler himself. Adherents to this proposition, the most brilliant of whom is the French polemicist, Pierre Fontaine (*Les Secrets du pétrole*, Paris, 1963) lean on the following:

1. From the day after the Russian Revolution (1917) which nationalised Caucasus oil, which was the property of Royal Dutch hell, founded by Deterding, the policy of the Foreign Office was directed towards its recovery, by diplomatic means at first. But about 1928, the Soviets having remained obdurate to all overtures, [70] the Foreign Office, inspired by Deterding, changed course and no longer envisaged this recovery except through war. At least that is what the adherents of this theory maintain. It was then that Deterding and Royal Dutch Shell are said to have subvented the National Socialist movement in Germany, whose leader, Hitler, they considered the only one capable of making a success of the operation.

2. In *Mein Kampf*, one reads (p. 705 of the first ed.): "If Germany wanted to reconquer territories in Europe this could only be done at Russia's expense... it is only with England covering the rear that a new Germanic migration could be undertaken... In Europe, in the near future, only two allies will be possible for Germany, England and Italy."

The parallelism of the views is striking to say the least. In 1936 Hitler suddenly felt that Britain was only making use of him to recover the Caucasus oil and that once this aim was achieved, she would change course and form new alliances in order to eliminate him. This feeling was inspired by the attitude of the British government towards the triumph of the Popular Front, which the communists put over in France in the legislative elections of May 1936. And from then on he rejected all British advances. All Deterding's efforts to get him to change his attitude were in vain. Royal Dutch Shell, in order to save at least the Rumanian oil, toyed with the idea of directing the policy of the Foreign Office towards an Anglo-Russian rapprochement. But Deterding, not in favour of this policy, resigned from his post of President

and Director-General and retired in Germany. In 1939, on the day of his death, two German diplomats in full regalia put on his coffin an immense wreath of flowers, in Hitler's colours.

There is much that is true in this interpretation. The writer of this work thinks, nevertheless, that for the Foreign Office the period 1936 to 1939 was a period of expectation and not of rupture for Britain, and that a definite rupture did not come until March 1939. Substantiation for this is to be found in the fact that British policy accommodated itself very well to all of Hitler's enterprises between 1936 and 1939 in defiance of the Versailles Treaty - that she even showed herself to be quite understanding. It is true that this period has not yet been thoroughly examined by historians and its exploration, as soon as it can be done, may well hold many surprises. It is apparently not to be doubted that through Deterding, Caucasus oil played a major role in British policy between the wars, the successes of Hitler in Germany and the unleashing of the Second World War.

In March 1939 Lord Halifax - and therefore the British government - discovered Poland and that was the end of the process of *de facto* revision of the Treaty of Versailles which had been, on the whole, fairly peaceful even if concerned with general rearmament. Hardly anything remained to be settled at that time except the German-Polish dispute over the Danzig corridor and [71] Silesia. Poland wanted the *status quo*; Germany, stressing the self-determination of the territories concerned and her right of access to East Prussia, was demanding an adjustment. Britain sided with Poland, which France had not ceased to defend since 1919, with the Anglo-Polish Guarantee Pact thereby strengthening the Franco-Polish Pact of the same name. Britain's attitude was later accounted for by the fact that if the German-Polish dispute had been peacefully settled, in conformity with the right of peoples to self-determination, Rumanian oil-exploited by British companies would have been considerably closer to Germany's grasp. In Rumania there was at the time a strong trend in favour of evicting the British companies. Germany supported the movement behind the scenes and the approach of German armies could only strengthen this movement, especially as Hungary was a friend of Germany. Taking all things into account, the argument is valid as an explanation of Britain's brusque counterblow. It even explains the Anglo-Russian rapprochement and the British military mission that joined the French military mission in Moscow... In March 1939 the British and French military missions communicated to their respective governments information that led them to think they could count on Russia's support in the event of a general European dispute. Thus the argument itself provided the answer that supported it. The whole matter can be summarised by saying that if until March 1939 Britain had looked with a benevolent and often approving eye on those revisions of the Treaty of Versailles made by Germany on her own prerogative, it was solely because she did not concede that the Franco-Russian Pact (1936) carried enough force to become a Franco-Anglo-Russian pact. In matters of foreign policy, as Napoleon tragically experienced, Russia has always been Britain's last resort as a means of ruling the continent. From the moment assurance was given by her agents that Russia would play the traditional game, there was no more reason to hesitate. But, Stalin was not Tsar Alexander and Hitler was not Napoleon.

We know the rest: August 23rd, 1939, German-Soviet Pact, partition of Poland and other gentlemen's agreements between Germany and Russia, which also had disputes to settle with Poland, the Baltic countries and the regions around the mouth of the Danube - all post Versailles Treaty.

Since Russia acted in connivance with Germany on the partition of Poland she was obviously just as guilty. But not at all. On April 2nd, 1946, at Nuremberg, a piece of incredible buffoonery took place when General Rudenko, Russian Prosecutor, personally asked Ribbentrop this question:

General Rudenko: Do you consider that the attack on Poland was an act of aggression on the part of Germany? (Volume X, p. 443)

In vain did Dr. Seidl (counsel for Rudolf Hess) and Dr. Horn (Von Ribbentrop's counsel) attempt to demonstrate that this question could not be put in that form. Each time they were told [72] that it was not Russia but Germany in the dock. Through sheer persistence they were able,

all the same, to bring out the reasons, which they found in the German-Soviet Pact and the component secret agreement, why they were asking that the question should not be so stated. (Testimony of the German Ambassador at Moscow, Dr. Friedrich Gaus: Volume X, pp. 14, 86, 325; Volume XI, pp. 611--612; Volume XII, p. 4 54; Volume XIV, pp. 299-301; Volume XV, p. 594, and testimony of von Weizsacker, Volume XIV, pp. 300-302, to cite only two.) But the German-Soviet Pact and the component secret agreement, whose provisions were only made public in this manner, were not put to Russia - of course!

For the edification of the reader the provisions contained in the documents cited above were, roughly (for naturally the Prosecution took every precaution to keep the German-Russian Pact and the Secret Agreement out of the hands of the Defence): in Poland, the line of demarcation between the two spheres of influence followed the Rysia, Bug, Narev and San Rivers; Germany disassociated herself from Latvia, Finland and Estonia, but laid claim to Lithuania; she further declared she had no other than economic interests in the Balkans, and later the Russians used this as an authorisation to demand military bases (especially in Bulgaria) which was, if not the cause, at last one of the reasons for Germany's entering into war with Russia on June 22nd, 1941. This shows that Russia held just as low an opinion of the Versailles Treaty and the right of peoples to self-determination as did Germany.

But the German-Soviet Pact and the secret agreement were not the only documents (and they were authentic!) which the judges at Nuremberg refused to consider. There was also the German White Book which the Defence tried to have admitted in connection with the invasion of Belgium, Norway and Greece, likewise laid to Germany's charge.

Here the Defence did not dispute Germany's guilt; it asked only that the conditions under which she had burdened her conscience with this crime be regarded. The German Government, the Defence claimed, had become convinced that if Germany had not invaded these territories the Allied Powers were themselves going to do so. The Government was informed by the agents of Admiral Canaris, whose information service probably rivalled M.I.5 or the F.B.I. At this point in its reasoning, the Defence declared that it was in a position to prove that the belief on Germany's part was justified. They reasoned thus: in June 1940, German troops found the archives of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs at Charité sur Loire (France) and in these archives documents, in particular a letter from General Gamelin to Daladier, and another from General Weygand to General Gamelin, and reports of Ministerial Councils or meetings of the French General Staff which established that the French and British had in readiness a plan for a landing at Narvik, the invasion of Belgium, the Ruhr, the destruction of [73] Rumania's oil and a landing at Salonika. The Defence, in short, wanted to show that Germany had succeeded where her adversaries had failed and that, for its part, it was a question only of a reaction of defence against planned aggression⁶. Furthermore, in the case of Greece, no decision was to be taken until invading British troops arrived in Crete. The reasoning was not without merit. The documents selected from the archives of the French Ministry of Foreign Affairs and on which the argument rested had been collected into a White Book by the German Government in 1941, and it was this White Book that the Defence intended to produce.

The Defence plea was rejected at the insistence of Sir Maxwell-Fyfe (British Prosecutor), Dodd (American Prosecutor) and Dubost (French Prosecutor) on two grounds: first, that at the moment Germany made the decision to invade she had no proof that her conviction was justified; second, that no confidence could be had in a German document such as the White Book precisely because it was German (session of May 16th, 1946). Of course, a German document could not be pertinent unless it accused Germany.

These are the arguments of the kind of casuists that Loyola would have been proud of, which were advanced against taking the Treaty of Versailles into consideration and which were particularly and most pertinently refuted by Dr. Seidl (counsel for Rudolf Hess, who had probably been sent to Britain by Hitler himself for a last attempt at negotiation with the British)

⁶ All of this has just been substantiated in France in Volume II of the Memoirs of M. Paul Reynaud, then President of the Council, recently Published with the title *Envers et contre tous* (May 1963) in which these documents and reports of the Ministerial Council are cited and commented upon in the terms and meaning used by the Defence before the Nuremberg Tribunal.

and Dr. Horn (counsel for von Ribbentrop). After some skirmishing during which they both marked numerous points, the unanimous argument of the Defence was summarised in this statement of Dr. Horn:

"There is no doubt that the Prosecution base their case on infractions of the Versailles Treaty. To these treaty infractions it is absolutely necessary, in my opinion, to examine the facts which allowed the legality of the treaty to be doubted. It is certain that it was signed under duress. International Law recognises that such treaties have grave deficiencies and considers them infamous.

"In my opinion we must be allowed to submit the facts that serve to show the soundness of this assertion and legal viewpoint.

"I do not wish to make any further statements on this point, but I ask that my first request be granted, that the documentary facts be allowed which would permit a judgement on the legal value of the Treaty of Versailles. " (Volume X, p. 94, 26th March, 1946).

Very solid.

Reply of Sir David Maxwell-Fyfe:

"In spite of all the respect due to Dr. Horn, I submit that it is [74] an unsound argument... Once it is admitted that there is a treaty and that an infraction is made, these are the conceded facts, and it is no answer to say that a number of admirable people have, in the signatory countries, believed that the terms of this were wrong. The treaty is there and the person who knowingly makes an infraction is breaking the treaty, regardless of the soundness of the arguments on which it is based..."

In saying that, Sir David Maxwell-Fyfe was surely not thinking of France, who violated the treaty by refusing to disarm, when it was acknowledged in 1927 that Germany had fulfilled the terms of the clauses relative to disarming, nor of Britain who violated it twice in May 1935 and July 1937, with the Anglo-German Naval Agreement. He was only the more at ease in continuing:

"It really does not help to know whether the defendant Hess acted in the belief that the Treaty of Versailles was bad, or to know what were the opinions of the Editor-in-Chief of the *Observer*, an English Sunday paper, or those of some number of the *Manchester Guardian*, twenty years ago, any more than it is useful to refer to what distinguished statesmen have written, regardless of the respect due them, about the event, years after it happened. " (Volume X, pp. 99).

Sir David Maxwell-Fyfe doubtless did not know that not only journalists and even statesmen had voiced views unfavourable to the Treaty of Versailles, but that there were countries which had refused to endorse it for the very reasons invoked by the Defence - America, for example!

Decision of the Tribunal:

"The Tribunal (after a recess) rules that evidence to establish the injustice of the Treaty of Versailles, or its imposition by force, is inadmissible, and therefore rejects document Vol. 3 on behalf of the defendant Hess." (Volume X, p. 99, afternoon session).

It could not be otherwise. To admit in evidence this book of documents would have been to admit the possibility that France, Britain and Russia at least, had themselves violated the Treaty of Versailles, which would lead directly to their being challenged as judges, which was forbidden, as we have seen, in Article 3.

In the case of the partition of Poland between Germany and Russia, as of that of the successive invasions of Belgium, Norway and Greece, it was really basically the same problem of the competence of the Tribunal that was posed.

Evasion was the only argument the Prosecution could put in opposition to the Defence.

It was also the only one which it could not openly use.

And that is why all the arguments which the Prosecution invoked were at the same time so constrained, hampered, involved and so mediocre.

Chapter IV

WAR CRIMES

Ideas about war crimes have changed considerably since 1945, with regard to the applications of the Geneva and Hague conventions to them. Indeed, the corpses of the eleven men hanged at Nuremberg were hardly cold before the universal conscience was asking itself the most sober questions about the rights of the Allies to set themselves up as judges and pronounce sentence. And since this conscience was from the beginning expressed through the voices of the most estimable people, it was quite impossible to be unaware of it. Among them figured men as universally known as Professor Gilbert Murray, the best known of British Hellenists, and the Dean of Rhodes House - both men from Oxford; the military writer Lidell Hart; the anarchist Israeli editor Victor Gollancz; Member of the House of Commons R. R. Stokes; Lord Hankey, Secretary of the renowned Committee for the Defence of the Empire from 1912 to 1938 and member of the British Cabinet from 1920-1921; the American Judge Wennerstrum, from the Supreme Court of the State of Iowa, who had been appointed to the bench of the Nuremberg Tribunal and who left the post abruptly after a few months; Senator Taft; Lord Bishop Chichester, who intervened in the House of Lords in strong language on June 23rd, 1948; Dibelius, Bishop of Berlin, etc. Most of them had protested long before the bodies of the hanged turned cold, even before the verdict was handed down. Their opposition was known to the best informed from the beginning of 1944 when the Allies' determination to hold a trial became public knowledge, but a conspiracy of silence worked against them and their protest was not known until long after.

There were few Germans among them. The abominable press campaign unleashed against Germany had made defendants of all of them and the Germans gave the impression of bowing their heads under blows. For any honest person looking back on the press and writings of the time, there is no possible doubt: the attorneys for the defendants in the Trial of the Major War Criminals performed acts of real heroism. Limited in their defence procedure, odiously distorted by the press, their interventions and pleadings often appeared timid, and sometimes inconsistent. Nonetheless, many of their speeches will one day be considered worthy of being included in an anthology. I am thinking particularly of the pleading concerning the incompetency of the Tribunal, presented in the name of all the defence counsels, by Dr. Stahmer, counsel for Goering, at the beginning of the session of November 19th, 1945, and rejected on the 21st "on the grounds that it called into question the competence of the Tribunal, it was in contradiction of Article 3 of the Charter." Article 3 stated, in fact, peremptorily that "neither [76] the Tribunal, its members nor their alternates, may be challenged by the Prosecution or by the defendants or their counsel."

I am thinking, too, of the intervention of Dr. Sauter, counsel for Ribbentrop, on the Treaty of Versailles; of Professors Exner and Jahreiss, counsels for Jodl, on breaches of international law; of Plottenrichter Kranzbuehler, counsel for Admiral Raeder, on maritime law; of Dr. Robert Servatius, counsel for Saukel, on procedure and forced labour; and of the others

who, although their performance was more modest, nonetheless stood out head and shoulders above the judges and prosecutors.

In France hardly more than the two admirable books by Maurice Bardèche, *Nuremberg ou la Terre Promise*, and *Nuremberg II ou les Faux-Monnaveurs* (Nuremberg, or the Promised Land and Nuremberg H, or the Counterfeiters) are worthy of being mentioned. The French Left, in power, saw in the contents of these two books only the political opinions of the author, who openly - and very pluckily - called himself a fascist. The Left raised a barrage against the books and the first was actually, and quite scandalously, banned. The ideas of the books, presented with rare objectivity, are the same ones that in my youth - taking Bertrand Russell, Mathias Morhardt, Romain Rolland, Anatole France, Jeanne and Michel Alexandre for guides - the European socialist parties and the world Left all held, and almost put across at the end of the war of 1914-1918 and up until 1933. It would be easy to demonstrate that these ideas, of ancient tradition, are really left-wing. There is much I could say on the shifting that took place when the Left, faced with the phenomenon of war, retreated to the traditional positions of the Right, while the Right resorted to those of the Left; but here the historian should cede the pen to the sociologist. So we will confine ourselves to mentioning one thing that offers useful comparisons. In 1914, too, the Left adopted the policies of the Right about war, but in 1918 it turned Left again while the Right, arrogant and impervious, remained stupidly set on dogmas of another age. Today it is the Left who are stupidly stuck on these dogmas of another age. This historic switch-back is curious to say the least.

In short, all the protests, whatever their source, and no matter which of the charges against Germany or the Germans they were concerned with, all the charges could equally well have been laid against the Allies, and therefore all of the parties concerned should have been seated in the dock. And if a trial had to be held, prosecutors and judges should only have been selected from among neutrals, who doubtless would have seated them all back to back.

Solid arguments were voiced on the subject of war crimes and crimes against humanity. First the Russians spoke concerning deportation and German concentration camps and propaganda concerning this was the touchstone of sensitivity in world opinion.

Field Marshal Goering, interrogated on March 21st, 1946 by [77] General Rudenko, the Russian prosecutor, had answered that "1,680,000 Poles and Ukrainians had been deported from territories occupied by the Soviet Union, and sent to the Far and Near East" (Report of the Proceedings, Volume IX, p. 673); he was not permitted to cite his references, nor to continue. The first Polish government in London had, meanwhile, published a paper according to which the number of Polish deportees lay between one million and 1,600,000 - 400,000 of whom perished during the voyage to the interior of Russia and among these, 77,834 children died out of 144,000 deported. It seems that this took place in February, April and June 1940, and June 1941. M. Montgomery Belgion, referring to the first Polish government in London added that according to information furnished to Miss Keren by the American Red Cross, and the Polish book *The Dark Side of the Moon* (London, 1943), the Russians extended the operation to the Balts: 60,940 Estonians, 60,000 Latvians, 70,000 Lithuanians.

May I add that in a small book, *Le Problème de la Silésie et le Droit* (The Problem of the Law and Silesia) which came out in 1958, the great French jurist Raymond de Geouffre de la Pradelle, referring to the 1947 Annual of the Central Statistics Office of Warsaw, published by the Polish government under Russian control, notes that 7,300,000 Germans were deported from Silesia to Germany by the Russians between July 1st, 1945 and January 1st, 1947, in application of an Anglo-American-Soviet convention on the transfer of populations. According to M. Jean de Pange, who made a study of this problem in the *Revue des Deux Mondes* of May 15th, 1952, the number of unfortunates who died during this operation, under inhuman conditions comparable in every way to those of our deportation to camps by the Germans, exceeded four million.

But evidently the Tribunal at Nuremberg was forbidden by the Charter to be apprised of that.

Against the Russians was further cited: the slaughter at Katyn for which a significant part of the world press still puts the burden of guilt on the Germans, although the Nuremberg Tribunal did not accept that, and in spite of the fact that it has now been established that they are to be charged to the Russian conscience; reprisals taken in 1944 against the Ukrainian and Polish civilian populations who had received the Germans as liberators in 1941; the treatment inflicted on German prisoners; the entry of Russian troops into all the German cities and the rape, pillage and massacre to which the civilians were subjected, etc.

In October 1944, in an "Appeal to the Red Army" which was not translated for the Nuremberg Tribunal, the Russo-chameleon writer Ilya Ehrenburg wrote:

"Kill, Kill! There are no innocent Germans, among the living, or among those yet to be born! Carry out Comrade Stalin's instructions to crush the fascist beast in his lair Shatter the pride [78] of the Germanic women with violence. Take them as lawful spoils. Kill, kill, valiant soldiers of the Red Army, in your irresistible onslaught. " (Cited by Admiral Doenitz in *10 Years and 20 Days*, pp. 343-344)

The war on the Eastern front between Germans and Russians was savagely brutal, defiant of international conventions and totally dehumanised on both sides. The clash of the armies was repeated in the clash of ideologies and doctrines; although illegal in the eyes of international conventions, partisan warfare was, for example, one of the sacred dogmas of popular or national emancipation in the eyes of the Russians. The formula "eye for an eye, tooth for a tooth" is profoundly immoral. No one has the right to take justice into his own hands, especially one who recognises a higher authority which renders justice for all.

The Einsatzgruppen, the "50 to 100 hostages executed for one German soldier assassinated" (order of Keitel, September 16th, 1941), the liquidation of Russian political commissars, viewed as partisans not as soldiers, etc., must also be examined and judged as German replies to a violation of international conventions by the Russians. The fact that the Germans were present and had witnessed the Russian occupation of that part of Poland conferred to them in the German-Soviet Pact, made them able to appraise their methods of warfare, and was one of the determinants of the attitude taken in that respect by the Oberkommando der Wehrmacht (O.K.W.).

The Americans, British and French were no less disqualified as judges than the Russians and that for breaches of the laws and customs of war no less serious or no less deliberate. To the count of the first two figured the extermination of the civilian population of almost all German cities by applying what the British called "saturation bombing" and which we called "obliteration bombing" which, as the word indicates, could obliterate entire cities and their inhabitants, just as much as phosphorus bombings. At Dresden, Leipzig and Hamburg the wretches who died crushed under masses of rubble, or burned alive in monstrous conflagrations which could not be put out and who actually became screaming and inextinguishable human torches rushing for water - of which there was not enough or which was non-existent - were counted by the hundreds of thousands in a single night, in each of the three cities.

The case of the Russians was all the more curious since they had been condemned, on December 14th, 1939, as aggressors against Poland and Finland by the Assembly and Council of the League of Nations. The fact that they turned up as judges at Nuremberg shows, to say the least, an astonishing development in international law between 1939 and 1945.

The atomic bombs dropped on Nagasaki and Hiroshima which, at the time, surpassed anything that could be imagined for horror and cynicism in war crimes, were taken into consideration. Special [79] mention was also made of the bombing at sea of German submarines and naval vessels which were proceeding to the rescue of shipwrecked persons, after having given clear radio notice of their mission on international long wave radio. The most typical case was that of U-boats 156, 506 and 507 which, on September 13th, 1942, were moving (in conformity with the laws of the sea) to the rescue of the crew and passengers of the *Laconia* (freight ship, armed with 14 guns of which two were 150 mm antiaircraft, grenades, etc. which put the ship in the prize category) which the U.156 had just torpedoed.

The record of the French is hardly any better: the Resistance and partisan war, which no clauses of The Hague protected; innumerable assassinations of German soldiers, stabbed in the back by invisible enemies; even massacres of prisoners who were protected by the Geneva Convention, such as the one that took place at Annecy (Savoy) on August 18th, 1944, and others in French camps after 1945, to such an extent that the International Red Cross was so disturbed that it even roused President Eisenhower himself.

All these violations of the Geneva and The Hague Conventions, i.e. the written law, certainly do not excuse Germany, who did her share. I have simply made a summary inventory to show that the infringements were multilateral and to point out, first of all, that if Germany was to be judged it should not have been by those judges; second, that once having taken place, a qualified Tribunal should have used its discretionary power to demand the appearance of Russia, Britain, America and France next to Germany in the dock.

Declared inadmissible by Article 3 of the Charter because it questioned the competency of the Tribunal, which was set up on that assumption, the argument which the Nuremberg judges christened *tu quoque* (You, too - implying "you did it, too") was also inadmissible by virtue of Article 18, because it was necessary to proceed rapidly. "The Tribunal shall," the Article read, "a) confine the Trial strictly to a rapid (expeditious) hearing of the issues raised by the charges; b) take strict measures to prevent any action which will cause unreasonable delay, and rule out irrelevant issues and statements of any kind whatsoever."

Justice however, which requires assumptions, cannot fail to be expeditious, and being expeditious, it is no longer justice.

* * *

If I selected the Laconia incident above all others and stated that it was typical, it is because more than any other it reveals a certain Machiavellianism in the Prosecution; in short, it was typical of that Machiavellianism.

The Laconia was a cargo ship which the Admiralty had turned into a troop transport. All other considerations apart, particularly [80] her offensive weapons, the equipment she carried for the detection of enemy submarines and the order to signal as soon as any had been detected... that alone put her, by the rules of the international conventions, in the category that could legitimately be torpedoed by the adversary. And I do not think that the right of the U.156 to torpedo her was questioned by anyone, at least not officially. A not too insistent attempt was made to rouse public opinion because of the 80 women and children on board. This was not pressed since it would have been easy to charge that their presence was an infraction of the international conventions, some- what as if on land a troop of soldiers advancing into battle had put them in front to keep the enemy from firing.

The Laconia was transporting 1,800 Italian prisoners of war who claimed, according to Admiral Doenitz (*op.cit.* p. 203) that "the British closed the hold doors, where they were when she was struck, and prevented them by force of arms from getting to the life-boats." You can hardly improve on that for a war crime!

What was actually argued at Nuremberg was the order which Admiral Doenitz issued, having drawn the logical conclusions from the American bombing of the rescuers who were acting in the great tradition of the sea, and the bombing of those who were shipwrecked, regardless of age or sex, who had been their allies.

"It is henceforth forbidden to attempt the rescue of persons on a torpedoed ship, or to pull men from the water to take them to small boats, to right-up turned over life boats, to provide food or water. Rescue is contrary to the most elementary principle of war, which commands the destruction of enemy ships and their crews."

The British prosecutor, Sir David Maxwell-Fyfe, did not fail to seize on this order to claim that it prescribed "the deliberate killing of ship-wrecked persons." It was all as if the British and

Americans, who had driven the Germans to desist from rescue at sea, wanted to establish grounds for charging them with the consequences of the crime, magnifying it by the use of an exegesis in line with the rules of pilpoul, and keeping strictly quiet about the crime itself.

Very fortunately a courageous witness, Fleet Admiral Nimitz, Chief of Naval Operations of the United States, stated:

"On general principles, United States submarines did not rescue enemy survivors, if undue additional hazard to the submarine resulted, or the submarine would thereby be prevented from accomplishing its further mission." (Nur. Volume XVII, p. 389, session of July 2nd, 1946)

In this deposition, Admiral Nimitz furthermore took into account the order given by the American naval authorities on December 7th, 1941, to attack Japanese merchant vessels without warning, since they were "usually around."

So the charge was not held against Admiral Doenitz and therefore not against Germany by the Nuremberg Tribunal, but world [81] opinion was never informed of that by the press which, reporting the hearings, informed the world a million times over that Admiral Doenitz had ordered the deliberate massacre of the crew of torpedoed ships.

Even today a considerable part of the press continues to perform its doughty deeds with the same energy.

This kind of Machiavellianism, given free rein by the Prosecution in the presentation of the documents and facts pertaining to the Laconia, seems to have been the general rule throughout the trial. It is seen again in the case of the obliteration bombing, mentioned elsewhere.

But how did the British and Americans get this idea in the first place?

There are two views on this problem: the one generally held and which William L. Shirer adopts in his *Rise and Fall of the Third Reich*; and the other put forward by J. M. Spaight, British Air Cabinet Minister, in his *Bombing Vindicated*. Both are concerned only with the question of knowing who started it first, which, though morally without importance, is nonetheless very important with regard to The Hague articles, which maintain that it is not at all a matter of indifference to know whether it is a question of British and American retaliation or German retaliation.

This is what William L. Shirer says, and what he presents as the official view:

"To begin with, there was a minor navigational error by the pilots of a dozen German bombers on the night of August 23. Directed to drop their loads in aircraft factories and oil tanks on the outskirts of London, they missed their mark and dropped bombs on the centre of the capital, blowing up some homes and killing some civilians. The British thought it was deliberate and as retaliation bombed Berlin the next evening... The R.A.F. came over in greater force on the night of August 28-29, and, as I noted in my diary, 'for the first time killed Germans in the capital.' The official count was ten killed and twenty-nine wounded. "

The fact that this officially recognised navigational error was at that time interpreted as a deliberate action on the part of the Germans, and that it provoked the immediate reaction of a British raid on Berlin the following night is understandable and easily pardoned. That they returned in force a few days later, when the Germans had offered no further provocation, is less understandable.

And the fact that (on this the official contention and William L. Shirer are silent) they kept it up until they provoked the retaliatory bombardment of Coventry, Birmingham, Sheffield and Southampton - their justification for Dresden, Leipzig and cannot be understood at all, and cannot be excused.

The view of the British Cabinet Minister for the Air rings another bell and throw another light upon the subject. According to him, this system of bombardment was to have begun well before [82] August 23rd, 1940 - on May 11th, to be exact. The General Staff of the Admiralty decided on it on that day, and that very evening 18 Whitley bombers in waves dropped sheets of

bombs on railway installations in the Ruhr, and unavoidably claimed an appreciable number of civilian victims. After that they were to continue insofar as they were not hindered by flak.

"Because we were doubtful about the psychological effect of propagandistic distortions of the truth that it was we who started the strategic bombing offensive, we have shrunk from giving our great decision of May 11th, 1940, the publicity⁷ which it deserved. That, surely, was a mistake. It was a splendid decision. It was as heroic, as self-sacrificing, as Russia's decision to adopt her policy of "scorched earth." It gave Coventry and Birmingham, Sheffield and Southampton, the right to look Kiev and Kharkov, Stalingrad and Sebastopol in the face. Our Soviet Allies would have been less critical of our inactivity in 1942 if they had understood what we had done." (*Bombing Vindicated*, cited by Maurice Bardèche in *Nuremberg ou la Terre Promise*. Present translator took the text from J. F. P. Veale, *Advance to Barbarism*, p. 121.)

The Germans, however, were not aroused until bombs fell on Berlin. On August 31st and September 1st, "after a week of constant English night bombing," William L. Shirer writes, "most of the capital's dailies carried the same headline: 'Cowardly British Attack,' then 'British Air Pirates over Berlin.' "

Finally on September 4th, at the Sportspalast, in his speech at the opening of the *Winterhilfe* (Winter Help) campaign, Hitler roused the indignant crowd listening to him to wild enthusiasm, by declaring:

"For three months I did not answer because I believed that such madness would cease. Mr. Churchill took this for a sign of weakness. Right now we are answering night for night. When the British airforce drop two or three or four thousand kilos of bombs, we will drop in a single night 150, 200, 300 or 400,000 kilos."

Indeed, until then, except for the navigational error pointed out by William L. Shirer, the German air force had not replied. From then on came Coventry, Birmingham, Sheffield, Southampton and... London itself. One bombing led to another and in 1944, the waves of horror reached Dresden, Leipzig, Hamburg and other places, but in 1944 Germany was unable to retaliate and the blankets of bombs fell on an enemy whose shoulders were already to the ground.

Concerning the crime which, according to both William L. Shirer and J. M. Spaight, was set in motion by the General Staff of the Admiralty, and of which both sides - the judge as well as the defendant - were guilty, the Nuremberg Tribunal accepted in evidence only the German reprisals, that is, those steps ordered to [83] be taken against British and American aviators forced to land on German territory for one reason or another, caught, so to speak, in the act.

The best known of these incidents, the one that raised the greatest outcry because it was considered inhuman, was the one disclosed in a memorandum found in the papers of the O.K.W., dated May 21st, 1944, regarding a decision of Hitler to have shot without trial the crews of the British or American planes responsible for certain specific actions. (Doc. P.S. 731, Volume XXVI, pp. 275-276)

This is what was contained in that memorandum, taken from the document volume cited above:

"The Führer has decided that in special cases the following measures shall be taken with regard to British and American crews. Enemy fliers brought down are to be shot without due process of law, in the following instances:

1. When they have fired on German crews coming down in parachute;
2. When they have attacked with the plane's weapons German aircraft which have been forced to land, and when their crews are still around;
3. For attacking public civilian trains;

⁷. This book was not published in Britain until April 1944.

4. When they have attacked with the plane's weapons isolated civilians, peasants, workers, isolated vehicles."

As it was presented this memorandum became an order, with nothing to show whether it was ever executed. The press reporting the Trial surrounded this note with an air of implication about "eternally inhuman Germany," tied it in with other similar notes or extracts taken out of context from other orders termed crimes, and that was all they said when it was presented to the Tribunal on March 20th, 1946. (*op. cit.* Volume IX, pp. 604-605) But if we take a look at the cross-examination of Goering (same date) we find that a mention is made in the margin of Warlimont, Chief of the General Staff, deputy to the Wehrmacht operations, of Keitel, Jodl, of General Korten, etc. ...and that what was intended was a poll of the members of the General Staff of the O.K.W. on a proposed order that Hitler had in mind. And if we look at Keitel's cross-examination (*op. cit.* Volume X, p. 572, and Volume XI, p. 21, April 4th and 8th, 1946) we learn that it concerned "a continual exchange of ideas expressed here and there about a measure Hitler wanted, which, thank God, was not put into effect, because the necessary instructions were not transmitted, and no order from the O.K.W. was ever set down or given, to this effect."

The Tribunal was obliged to yield to the evidence. Not so the press. Even today, many after-the-event anti-Nazi propagandists who call themselves historians, continue to publish, in the news or in books, this memorandum, probably jotted down during some class, which they take for one of a series of orders effectively executed.

[84]

It is true that British and American fliers were actually lynched or killed on the spot by a crowd up in arms which rushed on them when they touched the ground. But that is something else - a blameworthy group reaction, certainly, but very understandable.

The Prosecution wanted to have it that this group reaction had been ordered by remote control, by the directors of the Third Reich in the midst of war. And, to prove it, more documents were produced. Heading the list were the relevant notes, emanating from Warlimont, deputy to Keitel, documents P.S. 735 and P.S. 740 (*op. cit.* Volume XXVI, pp. 276 and 279). These documents implicated Goering and Ribbentrop in connection with a conference which supposedly took place some time before June 6th, 1944, at Klessheim Castle, during which, together with Himmler, they decided on a joint stand in conformity with what was laid down in the memorandum of May 21st. Unfortunately this meeting at Klessheim never took place, except in Warlimont's imagination. From whom Kaltenbrunner got the information is not reported. Moreover, Ribbentrop and Kaltenbrunner were able to prove without difficulty that they did not share, any more than did Keitel, those views that seemed to have been Hitler's, concerning the treatment of British and American fliers.

As their evidence crumbled, the Prosecution - determined at all costs to score a point - did not shrink from reaching back to an order of Hess, dated March 13th, 1940, relative to instructions to be given to the civilian population on the attitude to be taken in case of enemy plane or parachute landings on Reich territory (P.S. 062, Volume XXV, p. 119). In the fourth paragraph it stated that "enemy parachutists are to be arrested immediately and rendered harmless." Justice Jackson translated "rendered harmless" as "liquidated," doubtless because it was more in the fashion at the time, and his translation went around the world and continues in use in the press.

Then came an order from Himmler dated August 10th, 1943 (Doc. R. 110, Volume XXXVIII, pp. 313-314). For the benefit of all the superior officers of the operations services of the S.S. and the police, Himmler said, "It is not the business of the police to intervene in conflicts between the German civilian population and the British or American terrorist aviators, who have had to take to the parachute." Translation by the Prosecution: "...the army received orders not to protect them from lynching by the people. The Nazi government through its propaganda and police agents, took care to urge the civil population to attack and to kill fliers crashed to earth." (Session of November 21st, 1945. Volume II, p. 147) But, in his speech, Dr. Gawlik (counsel for the S.D. after March 18th, 1946) claimed, first, that this order was

addressed to the police only, not to the army, which is, after all, evident; second, that actually it was not the business of the police but of the S.D., whose job it continued to be. (Volume XXII, p. 40, session of August 27th, 1946) [85]

Then came Hitler's order, dated October 18th, 1942, re: the destruction of commandos and parachutists (Doc. P.S. 498, Volume XXVI, pp. 100-101). At least, this order was presented by the Prosecution in those terms. One has only to read it to see that "commando parachutists," not parachutists, or simple commandos are meant, those who are sent behind the lines to wage a kind of warfare rigorously forbidden by the Geneva conventions. This may be judged by the three essential points, given in as literal as possible a translation:

"Enemy not acting within Geneva convention, using liberated criminals for brutal commando work; they kill prisoners, and orders to this effect have been found. From now on we will do the same with British sabotage troops. So, I order, no pardons, even if they seem to be surrendering... "
(Condensed, Tr.)

Three more paragraphs specified further that if certain of those spies or saboteurs fell into the hands of the army, they should be at once handed over to the S.D.; that this order did not apply to enemy soldiers taken prisoner in open fighting; that chiefs of units and officers guilty of negligence in its execution would be liable to court-martial.

Finally, another and complementary order of the Führer, with the same date, gave explanation to Paragraph I of the original order.

It could be held on many points that this order was in contradiction of the Geneva and Hague conventions; but if it was judicially accepted, it had also to be admitted that one violation corresponded to the other, and both should have been judged. However, by application of Article 18 of the Charter, the first violation was declared "irrelevant," so only the second was admitted. And this was given out to the public with stress on such phrases as "soldiers in uniform or out" ... (commandos were issued uniforms for use in case they were captured in action, and civilian clothes for flight, mission accomplished), "with or without arms" (once in plain clothes, the arms were discarded), and it was not mentioned that the order did not include regular troops, as it expressly stated. If I have said that this order was also in contradiction of the Geneva and Hague conventions, it is because at least in the case of civilians, captured without arms, guilt could not be established without an investigation followed by a judgement. In any case, the business of "commando parachutists" had nothing in common with that of the fliers, with which it was associated, and therein lies the Machiavellianism. It should also be added that the document was read in German to the German defendants, that the actual title "*Geheime Kommandosache*" which was given, underlining that they were "*durch Flugzeuge angelandet oder mittels Fallschirmen*," to which the defendants could only nod, was translated into all the other languages as "commandos and parachutists," to make the association, and this, too, is not without a certain Machiavellianism.

[86]

One affair of British and American aviators - there was one, and a true one - that of the escapees from Luft Stalag III at Sagan (Silesia). On the night of March 24th-25th, 1944, 76 officers of the R.A.F. escaped from that camp which was allocated to prisoners of the Allied Air Army. Except for three, all were recaptured. Twenty-three did not get beyond the outskirts of the camp and were brought back during the day by the Observation Service of the Wehrmacht; the other 50 who fell into the hands of the police at various places in Germany within 48 hours were shot. First the International Red Cross, then the Protective Power - in this case Switzerland - were aroused, and Eden protested in the House of Commons. On June 12th, the Swiss Minister at Berlin received an official note from the German Minister of Foreign Affairs, explaining that the 50 escapees had been shot by the police "either when they resisted at the moment of their recapture, or during an attempt to escape again after their recapture." But the investigation of the International Red Cross and the Protective Power established without difficulty that that was not true, and that they had been shot on an order given to Himmler by Hitler. The order was unknown to all the defendants at the Nuremberg Trial except one -

Kaltenbrunner - who had retransmitted it, after receiving it from Hitler via Himmler, to the executive echelon of the R.S.H.A., of which he was the Head. This was a patent violation of that Geneva convention which recognises the right to escape. As to whether Hitler actually issued this order, all the testimony is in agreement. That of Keitel (Volume XI, pp. 8 ff.) and of Goering (Volume IX, pp. 380 ff.) (on whom the Prosecution wanted to put the responsibility for the matter) are particularly honest. Both showed conclusively that not only did they take no part, but that they were placed in such positions that they could do nothing to prevent it. Hitler went over Keitel's head, and Goering was informed too late. As for Kaltenbrunner and Ribbentrop, the first said that he merely transmitted an order which came from his superior, and that there were no two ways about it; the second offered an explanation which had been given him after an enquiry.

As far as I know, no exactly similar infractions in the treatment of war prisoners on the part of the British and Americans have been brought out. I have shown that others, in no way less horrible, were noted. Those of the Russians - who signed neither The Hague nor the Geneva conventions and therefore permitted themselves every licence - were worse. Even the French are not snow white. We have seen that in one case at least (Annecy) they did not wait for the prisoners to escape before shooting them en masse.

To sum up: the documents established that in Germany the pattern was for downed fliers to be sent to prisoner of war camps unless they were categorised as terrorists. The latter were turned over to the S.D., summarily judged and sentenced to death or sent [87] to concentration camps. In this category of documents belong those like the memorandum found in the papers of the O.K.W., dated May 21st, 1944, which established that Hitler wanted, but was unable to achieve, shooting without any legal procedure. At Nuremberg, Goering maintained that it was learned from interrogation of these terrorists that their governments had forbidden them to engage in the very acts they had performed, and that they were war criminals in the fullest sense of the term. And the Allies did not act any differently. Naval Lieutenant Eyck, commander of the U.582, was condemned to death together with all the officers on board, by a British war council after being sunk and taken prisoner following his destruction by gunfire of the flotsam and shipwrecked persons of a merchant ship which he had just torpedoed. They were executed on November 30th, 1945.

These are but a few examples to demonstrate that the accusation of war crimes could be applied to the judges as well as the defendants and therefore, irrefutably, to establish the incompetency of the Tribunal in the light of International Law as it was then.

Chapter V

CRIMES AGAINST HUMANITY

What Article 6 of the Charter called, in its strained and highflown style, crimes against humanity are those conditions to which hundreds of thousands - even millions - of men, women, old people and children were subjected by deportation to the concentration camps, there to live and die in numbers, coldly assassinated or killed little by little by the indescribable maltreatment inflicted on them; and among these assassinations and mistreatments, those more particularly inflicted on the Jews - the racial laws and gas chambers, about which there has been so much discussion.

The little interest which the Eichmann Trial stirred up in the world, contrary to the hopes of its protagonists; the fact that the reaction of their reading public impelled the great newspapers to recall the star reporters whom they had at first sent to Jerusalem, leaving behind only special correspondents or third rate police blotter reporters; the reprobation, and even indignation, it aroused in all circles - even in Israel - were signs that another truth than that of Nuremberg had already won acceptance. And this truth was that, until then, in its racist as in its general aspect, deportation had been represented to world opinion not as an historic fact, a matter of history, but in terms of the political uses which would be made of it by the international Zionist movement and the European statesmen put back in the saddle after the defeat of Germany. The principal object of the Nuremberg Trial was to make this possible by furnishing the justifications. Historical truth arrived at by a legal ruling is one more of the tragic innovations of our times.

Dissected and exposed in its every detail by the press, radio, the most improved propaganda media - not forgetting concentration camp literature - this legal ruling resulted in the fact that in public opinion, and even in the minds of historians, it was no longer the historical fact which determined the political uses that could be made of it, which defined the matter of the fact. This could not fail to be noticed because it is so very true that even if you can fool one person for a long time, many people for a while, it is not possible to fool all the people all the time.

The mechanics of the way it was worked were quite simple.

"The Tribunal," stated Article 19 of the Charter, "shall not be bound by technical rules of evidence..."

And Article 21, "The Tribunal shall not require proof of facts of common knowledge, but shall take judicial notice thereof."

And in practice this is the way these two propositions worked: when, to cite just one example, on January 11th, 1946, Dr. Franz Blaha, a Czech communist, stated before the court: "The gas chamber at Dachau was completed in 1944 and Dr. Rascher instructed me to examine the first victims. Of the 8 or 9 persons [89] in that chamber 3 were still living, but the others were dead. Their eyes were red, etc. . . ." (Volume V, p. 175), the Tribunal which was not bound by technical rules of evidence, did not ask proof of him, and the matter, being declared common knowledge, was accepted without further formality.

However, it is known that the gas chamber at Dachau was not completed and made workable until after the end of the war by the S.S., who followed after the inmates of the concentration camp, and no one had ever been gassed there.

Therefore, it can be said that the Czech communist, Dr. Franz Blaha, was nothing more than a common false witness.

But it can also be asked, how many Dr. Franz Blahas were there in the line of witnesses who appeared before the bar, or whose affidavits produced under oath were read, and who "witnessed" in the same way, the camps at Bergen-Belsen, Ravensbrück, Mauthausen, Auschwitz, etc.?

In the case of Mauthausen we have the witness, Alois Höllriegel, S.S. warder of the camp, who testified by affidavit on January 2nd, 1946:

"In the fall of 1942, I think it was, Ernst Kaltenbrunner visited Mauthausen. I was just then on duty, and I saw him twice. He went down into (!) the gas chamber with Ziereis, camp commandant, just when prisoners were being gassed. I was very familiar with the sounds that accompanied the process. I realised that the gas chamber was in operation. Kaltenbrunner was present. I saw him come out of the cellar where the gas chamber was located, when it was all over. " signed: Höllriegel (Doc. P.S. 2753, Volume IV, p. 302)

In August 1960, probably under pressure of the emotions stirred up in Germany by a series of well-attended talks that I gave in April, in which I had posed the question, the *Institute für Zeitgeschichte* of Munich gave the following to the press:

"Neither in Dachau nor in Bergen-Belsen, nor in Buchenwald have Jews or other prisoners been gassed. The gas oven in Dachau was never quite finished or put into operation... The mass annihilation of the Jews by gassing began in 1941-1942 and took place exclusively in some few establishments selected for that purpose and provided with technical facilities suitable for that purpose, establishments above all in the occupied Polish area (but nowhere in Germany proper). " (*Die Zeit*, Hamburg, 19.8.1960)

Even though "witnesses" appeared again in June 1961 before the Tribunal of Jerusalem, in judgement on Eichmann, to state that they had seen their companions in distress leave for the gas chambers of Bergen-Belsen, and were not expelled from the court as false witnesses, or were not arrested in the midst of the hearing for contempt of court, the question of gas chambers holds good only for Auschwitz and the "camps in occupied Poland."

And strangely, that simplified the problem with regard to 1948, the period when all I had at my disposal to cast doubts on the [90] existence of gas chambers, was the report of the Nuremberg Trial, the "Analysis" of one of those responsible at Dachau (published by the American authorities for the Commission in charge of judging petitions for pardon) and my own experience at Buchenwald-Dora, that is, a period when "concentration camp literature" had just swept through public opinion and put gas chambers in almost every concentration camp. So I started, with the aid of clearly distorted documents, by proving that the one at Dachau was a myth, both macabre and odious. Making reference to my own experience, I did the same for Buchenwald and Dora, about which a priest, who had been a fellow-prisoner, had just written that he had seen "thousands and thousands of people" go in (to the gas chambers). (Abbé Jean-Paul Renard, *Chaînes et Lumières*, Paris, 1947). And so on, as the thirteen Nuremberg proceedings brought pertinent documents to light. I was, of course, vilified and even brought to court, where I was, naturally, acquitted, and from then on the game was won. It is today conceded that nowhere on German territory was there a single camp equipped with a gas chamber. The *Institut für Zeitgeschichte*, which is the "paragon of hostility and opposition to Nazism," finally acknowledged the fact. It remains only to examine the documents and testimonies brought forward in support of the existence and criminal use of gas chambers in the camps in occupied Poland, with as much care as those produced either before a tribunal or directly to public opinion, whose contents have been considered by a tribunal to be "of common knowledge," by the application of Articles 19 and 21 of the Nuremberg Charter.

To my knowledge those camps in occupied Poland were: Auschwitz-Birkenau, Chelmno, Belzec, Maidanek, Sobibor and Treblinka. In the last five of these, the existence and use of gas chambers to exterminate Jews is attested by a single document, the document labelled 'Gerstein,' produced at Nuremberg on January 30th, 1946, by M. Dubost, French prosecutor, P.S. 1533. An analysis and significant excerpts from the document will be found in the last chapter of this volume. Its history was so peculiar and its contents so apocryphal, that the Tribunal refused to hear it read (Volume VI, p. 377), and it was not admitted in evidence against the defendants. Nevertheless, the entire press considered it authentic; it was brought up again against other defendants in subsequent Nuremberg trials, in particular the one for Nazi organisations, and people like M. Poliakov - who call themselves historians - still write about it in their books (*Le Bréviaire de la Haine*, p. 228 ff.) (Breviary of Hate) as if it were irrefutable and had been admitted.

In this document it is a matter of the gas discharged from Diesel engines being piped into rooms 25 square metres in area and 1.90 metres high, in which were asphyxiated from 20 to 30,000 persons a day (!!) in batches of 750 to 800 (!). At Jerusalem, Eichmann stated that he had been shown at a distance "little houses" in [91] which "they told him..."

Document N.O. 365 is still being cited, which is a letter from a certain Dr. Wetzel, dated October 16th, 1941, in which "gas machines" (*Gasapparaten*) are mentioned.

This Wetzel was arrested in Hanover on August 17th, 1961. On August 18th, German newspapers published both that he was living on a government pension of 1,600 DM a month and that, thanks to the British-Jewish historian Reitlinger, author of a book giving credence to gas chambers on the basis of information supplied by him, he had up until then never been disturbed. I quote from the *Allgäuer Anzeigblatt* of August 18th, 1961:

"In the opinion of the authorities Wetzel was indebted for his incognito, which lasted for years, to the British historian Gerald Reitlinger, who, in his book, which is recognised as a standard work, *The Final Solution*, gave Wetzel erroneously the first name of 'Ernst'."

If it was true, this fact would markedly cut across the full significance of Document N. O. 365, in that it gives historians the right to question whether, as in the case of the Gerstein document, it was not fabricated after the event, to suit a purpose. In any case, the man was arrested and they will not fail to make him talk.

Finally, the testimony of Rudolph Hoess is cited, commandant of Auschwitz camp, who, incidentally, did know something about the matter (P.S. 3868, Volume XI, p. 425; Volume XXI, p. 560; Volume XXXIII, p. 275) and his memoirs written up in prison after he was sentenced to death (published after he was hanged under the title *The Commandant of Auschwitz Speaks*). We will see later what to think of this testimony.

And so to the Auschwitz-Birkenau camp...

The documentation about this camp, which is in the final analysis the crux of the matter, is both abundant and precise - so abundant and even so precise that that is what kills it. The different parts of this immense dossier all confirm the existence and use of gas chambers for the extermination of Jews, but, on the whole, they are in agreement only on that point. The details which they offer in description of the places and the mechanics of the operation contradict each other with such pigheadedness that they can be said to cancel each other out. If, for example, of two witnesses who claim to have been present, one tells us that Zyklon B (the gas used) came in the form of pellets which volatilised on contact with water vapour (Hoess), and the other tells us that water vapour prevented the formation of gas (Dr. Miklos Niyszli, author of *Doctor at Auschwitz*) it is obvious that one cannot believe the one and still believe the other, and that prudence cautions that at least one of the two is a false witness. If one witness tells us that he went into a gas chamber, which an official document says was 400 meters square, that there were benches on each side for sitting and hollow columns every 20 meters in the middle, that 3,000 persons could easily circulate in it and that it was roughly [92] 200 meters long, it is not possible to believe, after reading such a catalogue of improbabilities, that he ever set foot inside. And if, as is the case with Dr. Miklos Niyszli, he adds "the dead were stripped at the exit of the

gas chamber" after having been asphyxiated, or that in 1944 this method of extermination had already existed "for four years", one is forced to think that we have here a common impostor.

At the first Nuremberg Trial of the major war criminals, there was on hand:

1. Testimonies of survivors who have without exception authenticated the gas chambers, not only by what they had seen, but by what they had heard. Their testimonies are like that of Dr. Benedict Kautsky who, following his father, was leader of the Austrian Social-Democratic Party, who spent three years at Auschwitz-Birkenau, who wrote a book about his experiences, *Teufel und Verdammte* (Devil and Damned), published in Switzerland in 1946, which stated clearly: "Here I want to introduce a short description of the gas chambers, which, to be sure, I have not myself seen, but which have been described to me by so many people worthy of belief..." (p. 272)

"The naked victims were... crammed together in another room, which was tiled and furnished with showers in the ceiling... When the space was full, the doors were closed and the showers turned on; from them streamed no water, but gas... In Auschwitz by mass gassing, at the very least... 3,5 million persons have been killed." (p. 275)

So, this witness who says on another page that the maximum survival expectancy at Auschwitz was *about three months*, but who survived there himself *for three years*, admits that he never saw a gas chamber and speaks of them only in accordance with what he was told by reliable persons. One notes that he is not the more miserly with his details for all that. He knows that 3,5 million people were exterminated in that manner, and also that the gas used was heavier than air since it fell from the ceiling - still another version, since the other witnesses had the gas come from pellets thrown on the ground, from which it issued in contact with water vapour, according to some, or just contact with the air according to others.

At Nuremberg, Colonel Storey, American Attorney-General, was fascinated by that version in which the asphyxiating gas was discharged from shower installations. He presented with the utmost seriousness document P.S. 2285 (Volume IV, p. 270) in which was said, "When an arrival of 'K' prisoners was too important, instead of wasting time 'measuring' them, they were exterminated by asphyxiation, by means of gas forced into the shower room through the water pipes."

2. Corroborating testimonies for Rudolf Hoess, commandant of the camp already mentioned, and those of two collaborators of Eichmann, Obersturmführer Hoettl, and Obersturmführer O. [93] Wizliceny. Only the second is still alive, the two others having been hanged.

Concerning Rudolf Hoess - his testimony was written in pencil on old paper and is therefore difficult to decipher because it is difficult to read; it was written by a man over whom a death sentence hung and who would certainly be tempted to say whatever he thought might be conducive to the acceptance of his petition for pardon; furthermore he contradicts himself on every page.

From Hoettl we have only the number of Jews exterminated, which was given to him in confidence by Eichmann: 4 to 5 million which, for good measure, was rounded up to 6. But at Jerusalem Eichmann stated during his trial that he never confided any such information to Hoettl.

Finally, from Wizliceny we have, in addition to confirmation of the above figure, an affirmation in which Eichmann is supposed to have shown him a letter from Himmler which enjoined him to proceed to the "final solution of the Jewish problem," that is, gas chambers. However, there again Eichmann stated that he had never received a written order from anyone, that he had only told Wizliceny that "Heydrich had summoned him to inform him that the Führer had ordered the physical destruction of the Jews." (Jerusalem trial, session of April 10th, 1961, Eichmann confessions, on tape recording, presented to the Tribunal.)

Wizliceny therefore lied, and that can be affirmed without fear of contradiction since the problem of the extermination orders has been resolved. In *La Terre retrouvée*, of December 15th, 1960, Dr. Kubovy of the Jewish Documentation Centre of Tel Aviv, admits in effect "that

no document signed by Hitler, Himmler or Heydrich exists, which speaks of exterminating the Jews, and that the word extermination does not appear in Goering's letter to Heydrich concerning the final solution of the Jewish question." It is, of course, a little late to acknowledge that, but better late than never. So it is settled: all those orders received by so many in 1946 existed only in the imagination of those who claimed to have received them.

Subsequently, during the other Nuremberg Trials, especially that of the Wilhelmstrasse and Nazi organisations, other documents were brought to light: the Wannsee Protocol (N.G. 2586g), the statement of a certain Wolfgang Grosch (N.O. 2154) concerning orders for the construction of gas chambers, etc.

The Wannsee Protocol is the report of a meeting which took place on January 20th, 1942, at which were present the Secretaries of State administratively interested in the solution of the Jewish Question and the heads of services charged with carrying it out. It is a question of a text in which there is no mention of gas chambers or of extermination, but only of the transfer of Jews to the East of Europe. This is quite cleverly worded and drawn up so that one can deduce that even if there is no express mention of it, nevertheless, it implicitly contains the decision for extermination.

Apart from that, this report has all the characteristics of an apocryphal document if it is compared with the photocopy of it which was published in the book of Mr. Robert N. W. Kempner, *Eichmann und Komplizen*, p. 132 ff. (Europe Verlag, 1961): no seal, no date, no signature, ordinary typewriter letters on a paper of reduced format, etc.

In any case, I repeat, there is no question here of gas chambers and if there is any question of extermination, it is only by distortion of the text.

The following is an example of this distortion in a French version made of the text: "*die Zurückdrängung der Juden aus dem Lebensraum des deutschen Volkes*" was translated as "l'élimination des Juifs de l'espace vital du peuple allemand," giving in the commentary the sense of extermination to the word expulsion, when it is really a question of the "refoulement des Juifs hors de l'espace vital du peuple allemand." The same was done in English and in Russian. For years afterwards the German press has been reproducing these versions, retranslated into German, commentaries included.

However, to express their decision to drive the Jews out of What they called their living space, the Germans preferred to use other words with the same meaning, such as *Ausschaltung* (exclusion, eviction, elimination), or, especially, *Ausrottung* (extirpation, uprooting). It is this latter word which has been translated by extermination, which in German is *Vernichtung*. For an example, in his talk at Posen to the *Obergruppenführer* (division of generals of the Waffen S.S.) on October 4th, 1943, Himmler said, "*Ich meine jetzt die Judenevakuierung, die Ausrottung des jüdischen Volkes... Das jüdische Volk wird ausgerottet...*" To make his meaning clear, he used the word *Ausschaltung* in the next sentence (P.S. 1919, Volume XXIX, p. 145). In other words, "Je pense maintenant à l'évacuation des Juifs, à l'extirpation du peuple juif... But in *Dossier Eichmann*, M. Billig has this translation, "J'entends par là l'évacuation des Juifs, l'extermination du peuple juif," (p. 55) and "l'évacuation des Juifs, c'est-à-dire extermination." (p. 47)

Another example: In a note of December 16th, 1941, on one of his conversations with Hitler (P.S. 1517, Volume XXVII, p. 270) Rosenberg uses the expression "*Ausrottung des Judentums*." In the session of April. 17th, 1946, the American Attorney General Dodd translated it as "Extermination of the Jews." (Volume XI, p. 562). Rosenberg protested in vain.

But in the speeches of the Nazis, the expression "*Ausrottung des Christentums*" recurs frequently, and is each time translated as "extirpation of Christianity from German culture." (cf. *Revue d'Histoire de la seconde guerre mondiale*, October 1st, 1956, p. 62). It is only when it is a question of Judaism (*Judentum*), or of the Jewish people (*das jüdische Volk*) that the word *Ausrottung* means [95] *extermination*, and is applied to *individuals*, when it is a question of entities.

If, as we have seen elsewhere, Dr. Kubovy, Director of the Centre of Jewish Documentation at Tel Aviv, writes that there existed "no document bearing the signature of Hitler, Himmler or Heydrich referring to exterminating the Jews" it is doubtless because he himself was drawing the difference between the individual and the *entity*, and that neither had he found the word in Himmler's talk at Posen. Even if one wanted to give that meaning to the word *Ausrottung* (it often has in German, for example, when it is used for pulling weeds out of a garden: in this case Brockhaus says it is a question of "völlige Vernichtung") it means in all languages that one can destroy an entity without destroying the individuals which it embodies, and of whose common characteristics it is a summary. For example, one can destroy Christianity without destroying Christians, Judaism or the Jewish people without destroying Jews. From 1945 until now, the Russians have completely destroyed the German community without having destroyed the Germans, by cutting it into three parts. This view is all the less disputable concerning the Jewish People because the German word "volk" has no exact corresponding word in any other language (except - oh irony! - in Hebrew). In German, a people is not only the individuals but the earth on which they live and which makes up a whole with them, *das Volk*. In German, "arrachés" (pulled out, *ausgerottet*) from the soil on which they lived, the Jews were destroyed (*vernichtet*) as a People, but nonetheless continued to live as individuals, in the camps where they were concentrated. In principle, at least. Having said this, in the Wannsee Protocol, there is no question of *Ausrottung*, nor even of *Ausschaltung*, but only of *Zurückdrängung* (refoulement, expulsion) and the distortion of this meaning is all the more serious in the matter of this document, if it is truly authentic, which is far from being proved by the photocopy (cf. above p. 80).

The last of the documents cited, the statement of Wolfgang Grosch, appears as follows:

"I, the undersigned, Wolfgang Grosch, attest and declare the following:

Concerning the construction of gas chambers and crematory ovens, it was the responsibility of C group, after receiving orders from D group. The chain of hierarchy was: D group got together with C group. Service CI laid down the plans for these installations, insofar as the construction itself was concerned, then turned them over to Service CIII, which filled in the mechanical aspects of the construction, such as the removal of air from the gas chambers, or the apparatus for the gassing. Service CIII then turned the plans over to a private concern, which was to deliver the special machines, or the crematory ovens. Still within the chain of command, Service CIII notified Service CVI which passed on the order via the superintendent of works west, south or east, [96] to the central office of works. The central office of works then passed the construction order to the respective office for the construction of concentration camps, which had the structures proper built by the prisoners which the office of Service DIII put at their disposal. Service D gave to Service C the orders and instructions about the dimensions and use of the structures. Basically, it was group D which gave the orders for the gas chambers and the crematory ovens. "

The facts detailed in this gibberish - obviously intended to create confusion - are described in the documents found in the Construction Service (*Bauleitung*) of the *Reichssicherheitshauptamt* (R.S.H.A.), dated January 28th, 1942, numbers 932 and 938, completed by another found in the Economic and Financial Services, with the reference N 11450/42/BI/H, dated August 3rd, 1942.

The first two are construction plans for four crematory ovens at Auschwitz-Birkenau, numbered II-III-IV and V, which leads one to suppose that I has not been found, at least to my knowledge. Each one was to have a large room in the basement, called Leichenkeller for II and III, and Badeanstalt for IV and V. The dimensions were specified: 210 sq.m. area, height 2.4m for II, 400 sq.m., height 2.3m. for III, 580 sq.m. and the same height for IV and V.

We will never know how these plans were executed on the spot. The Auschwitz gas chambers were destroyed as the Russian troops approached, on November 17th according to some documents, on 25th according to others. Those which can be visited in the camps today, like those at Dachau, were reconstructed after the war - in conformity with the plans? That is the question. I point out in passing that the visitor who goes to Buchenwald to see the remains of

the camp is taken in hand by a guard who shows him the gas chamber and explains to him in detail how it operated in the extermination of Jews. This happened to Claude-Henri Salerne of the R.T.F. who was preparing to put this information on the air for the retrospective survey he had been asked to make on concentration camps on the occasion of the opening of the Eichmann Trial (April 1961), when, by chance, a few days before, he fortunately ran into me!

To return to the documents: letter no. 11450/42/BI/H of August 3rd, 1942 (extract from document N.O. 4401), is the order for those four crematory ovens from Haus Topf und Soehne of Erfurt. In the Wilhelmstrasse and Nazi organisations trial it was pointed out, without further detail, that the order was delivered "at the outset of 1943." In his book *Doctor at Auschwitz*, Dr. Miklos Nyiszli speaks of the "heart of winter," which usually means the end of January and beginning of February, and the *Revue d'Histoire de la seconde guerre mondiale*, published in Paris under the direction of the *Résistant*, Henri Michel (the only one, except for the reports of the hearings, wherein I have found these documents [97] mentioned) uses the phrase, "at the outset of 1943" (in the October 1946 issue, p. 62), and the document N.O. 4463 gives "le 20-2-1943." Lastly, Hoess says that at the end of 1942 gas chambers and crematory ovens had not yet been built.

It was the halls built below ground, beneath the crematory ovens, officially designated as *Leichenkeller* or *Badeanstalt*, that the witness Wolfgang Grosch christened gas chambers. Since invoices for deliveries of Zyklon B to Auschwitz-Birkenau were found, they were used in support of his statement if they did not suggest it to him - as we are entitled to wonder after what happened in the case of the Gerstein statement! But Zyklon B was an insecticide-disinfectant, used in the German Army since 1924.

During World War II it was used in all the army camps and in all the concentration camps; other invoices found prove this for Oranienburg, Bergen-Belsen etc., where there were no gas chambers. As for the crematory ovens, I can attest that what we called the "basement" at Buchenwald was built on exactly the same model as those at Auschwitz-Birkenau and that no extermination by gas ever took place there.

What is curious is that the orders to build these *Badeanstalten* and *Leichenkeller* have been found, but none as to what was their intended use. It is not clear how those who had to make use of these places, whether as shower rooms or as mortuaries, could have divined that they were actually gas chambers. On the other hand, it is claimed that orders exist to cease the extermination of Jews in this manner. We are told that the reason why no orders to use them as gas chambers have been found is because the Nazis were not so stupid as to give orders that could later be found and used as accusations against them. But then it is hard to see how they could have been so stupid as to issue an order - just as accusatory, just as easy to find - to cease making use of them. Actually, not even this order has been found, only someone who attested its existence, dated "between the middle of September and the middle of October" (Document P.S. 3762, Volume XXXIII, pp. 68-70), which is a remarkably precise date. This someone was the Standartenführer Kurt Becher, who took part, along with Eichmann, in the deportation of Hungarian Jews. Becher was, however, cleverer than Eichmann and knew enough to earn the gratitude of Dr. Rudolf Kasztner (responsible for his acquittal at Nuremberg, and who very probably wrote his "Bericht," cited in this work only for that reason), and of Baroness Weiss (owner of the Manfred Weiss factories of Budapest) whom he had taken by special plane to Lisbon with 45 members of her family. The circumstances of his testimony having been thus given for the edification of the reader, this is what the witness said:

"I, the undersigned Kurt Becher, former S.S. Standartenführer, born on September 12th, 1909, at Hamburg, declare the following under oath: between the middle of September and the middle of October, I induced Reichsführer S.S. Himmler to promulgate the [98] following order, of which I received two copies, one each for S.S. Obergruppenführer Kaltenbrunner and Pohl, and one more for myself:

'I forbid, effective immediately, all extermination of Jews, and I order, on the contrary, that care be given to sick and weakened persons. I hold you (he meant Kaltenbrunner and Pohl) personally responsible, even in cases where this order may not be strictly observed by the lower echelons.'

"I personally brought Pohl's copy to him to his office in Berlin, and likewise I gave Kaltenbrunner's copy to his secretary in Berlin."

But he did not produce this order, a copy of which he had received. Nor was it asked of him. And they refused to confront him with Kaltenbrunner, who did not deny the existence of the order but merely denied any personal responsibility for it. Eichmann, who also did not repudiate the order, did deny, on the other hand, that it was a written order and cited May 15th, 1944 as the date, which was precisely the date when Himmler ordered the cessation of all medical experiments in all the camps (text found and cited by François Bayle in *Croix Gammée contre Caducée* (Swastika against Caduceus), p. 236), and thought of the plan to exchange a million Jews for 10,000 trucks. It is at least probable that Himmler did not simultaneously plan that exchange and the extermination of Jews in gas chambers at Auschwitz since the two are contradictory. But did this order really exist? It is easy to imagine that it had to exist for the prosecution, which so far had not found a single written trace of racial exterminations and could possibly only find it here - yet still did not find it. But everyone will agree that with this as the only proof, no historian worthy of the name would ever admit that this order did in fact exist. After all, everything depends on the trust bestowed on Mr. Kurt Becher, and Mr. Kurt Becher... In short, I think I have made myself clear: *testis unus, testis nullus*. Well, there are counter-testimonies worth as much as Becher's (Eichmann), or better (Himmler's letter on the experiments in the camps, dated May 15th, 1944 and recovered by François Bayle).

The least one can say is that all this is hardly convincing and, even more, that it tends to show that there never were any gas chambers, nor any exterminations by that method at-Auschwitz-Birkenau. If, however, gas chambers did exist, their existence cannot be said to be irrefutably established, either by the testimonies and documents which were brought forth during the various Nuremberg trials, or by the recitations of the survivors, widely disseminated to the public, who all say, with the exception of two (Hoess and Dr. Miklos Niyszli, in flagrant contradiction to each other and sometimes to themselves) that they saw nothing, but that they learned it from "reliable persons," which persons have never been traced.

I will say nothing of the celebrated "death buses" whose existence and utilisation are attested by Document P.S. 501 [99] (Volume XXVI, p. 1-2-10), which is an account by a sublieutenant from Marioupol with the date May 15th, 1942. The whole text will be found in the fourth part of this work, taken from David Rousset, who reproduced it in *Le Pitre ne rit pas* (The Clown does not laugh) (Paris, 1948).

These "buses", which the indictment refers to as "trucks", were supposedly equipped for asphyxiation by using the motor exhaust. 100,000 Jews are said to have been gassed in this way. Even at the rate of 50, or even 100 per "bus" or "truck", take your choice, one can see what a task it was. This idea, which poses the problem of whether there was time to asphyxiate 100,000 people in this way, or whether a considerable number of these "vehicles" - of which not one has been recovered - existed, in itself reveals the imbecility of the contention that this was part of a vast plan, perfected by the authorities of the Third Reich, to exterminate the Jews. If in truth vehicles of this kind did exist, they can only have been produced by private initiative and only the smallest number could have been produced. The cases reported are considered to have happened in the region of Chelmo, under the authority of one Globochnik. When one knows Globochnik (cp. 5th part), one can obviously not swear that he would not be an initiator of such a scheme. But extermination in numbers of 100,000 is manifestly just as false. If it were a few hundred, it would be possible to accept the figure; but 100,000, no, absolutely not. Eichmann stated during his trial that he had seen one of these vehicles; that he did not see what was taking place inside, either when it departed or whilst en route; but that when it arrived, a whole heap of cadavers was unloaded from it. What is this testimony worth? I do not know. What does bother me, however, is that in order to describe these "buses", "trucks" or "vehicles", as the press so often did, the document produced at Nuremberg on November 21st, 1945 by the American prosecutor, Justice Jackson (T. II, p. 135), and taken up again by his alternate, Commander Walsh (T. III, p. 563--65), designates the kind of car with the word "Wagen", which the Germans never use in that way. It must, in fact, be one of two things:

either they were buses, and P.K.W. (*Personalkraftwagen*) were meant, or they were trucks and L.K.W. (*Lastkraftwagen*) were meant, and if the author of the document did not know, I may be permitted to question his nationality. On the other hand, the author, a certain S.S. Untersturmführer Dr. Becker, whose testimony is unique, like Gerstein and so many others whose testimony was both exceptional and most devastating, is considered dead. In the Nuremberg Trial there were too many witnesses who had died too opportunely, whose so-called writings were used. In short, except for Eichmann who "refused" to see, as far as I know not a single one of these "bustrack-vehicles", not a person who had made use of them, nor even driven them has ever been found. In sum, a historical event which has left no traces. Happily, the inventor of these infernal machines, [100] a certain Harry Wentrutt, a foreman mechanic, they say, was arrested on January 29th, 1961 in Hanover. Since then nothing has been heard of him. Doubtless his trial is being prepared... or they are waiting for him to pass away, too. If he does not die soon he will speak one day. Unhappily, however, taking into consideration the conditions under which he would speak if given the chance, even this far in advance it is impossible to believe that he will tell the Gospel truth. Long experience teaches that there are few witnesses who, under threat of severe sentence and after long imprisonment, will not end up saying just about what is expected of them. Hoess, Hoettl, Wizliceny etc. are significant testimony. This state of affairs, however, is not without consolation, nor is it hopeless. We are no longer in 1946 but in 1963; today we have sufficient documentation to prevent any old person, as in 1946, from coming along to tell us any old tale. Sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof. At first it was said that Saurer trucks were involved; they had to quickly realise then, that the Saurer firm had not manufactured trucks of that kind since 1912, which was a little bit thick.

* * *

To finish with the problem of the treatment inflicted on the Jews, I would like to cite one more document with regard to decisions made concerning the Jews by the authorities of the Third Reich and the use made of documents relating to gas chambers: the Kasztner report, *Bericht der Jüdischen Rettungskomitees aus Budapest, 1942-1945*. It is quite a story.

Dr. Kasztner was President of the Comité de Salut des Juifs in Budapest from 1942 to 1945. In this capacity he was in constant contact with the German authorities in Hungary from March 19th, 1944 until the end of the war. He took part in getting the exchange of "a million Jews for ten thousand trucks" underway, as recounted by Joël Brand and Alex Weisberg in a book already referred to in this work. At the end of the war, before returning to Israel, Dr. Kasztner related what he had witnessed at the instance of the authorities of international Zionism and those of Nuremberg. However, only a small number of copies of his report were made and they were only in duplicated (cyclostyled) form. The first recipient of this report was *Standartenführer* (Colonel) Kurt Becher. It seems that Becher was Eichmann's superior officer (the latter was only Lt. Col.) in the matter of the deportation of Hungarian Jews, and therefore responsible to Himmler, with whom he was in direct contact (even over the head of Kaltenbrunner, top man of the R.S.H.A.), for the whole operation. Thanks to this Kasztner report, which almost completely whitewashes him, Kurt Becher was favourably denazified. He is living today at Bremen, where he has built up a fortune in the horse business estimated to be in the millions.

[101]

Briefly, a convinced Zionist, Dr. Kasztner settled in Israel right after the war and soon became an influential member of the Mapai, Mr. Ben Gurion's party. In 1954 he was charged that, in his capacity as President of the Budapest Committee during the German occupation, he had sold himself to the Nazis in order to save his family, thanks to the Bergen-Belsen convoy (was one then "saved" by being sent to Bergen-Belsen and the "gas chambers"?), and that he had become a purveyor for the Gestapo, with whom, in addition, he shared the goods pillaged

from the Jews before they were deported, etc. The charge was raised by another Hungarian Jew who had also come to settle in Israel where he exercised his profession as a journalist for the religious-conservative party (which all the other political factions in Israel consider to be fascist, and accuse of having dealings with the neo-fascist parties). And, because Kasztner's report on the activity of the Budapest Committee had been used to exonerate Becher and had effectively led to his acquittal at Nuremberg, the journalist in question furthermore charged Kasztner with having contrived the denazification of a "war criminal with whom he had done business."

Kasztner sued his accuser for libel. The trial unfolded in Jerusalem in 1955 and assumed unexpected dimensions: 73 sessions, 2,000 pages of reports - the country was stirred up, a clash between the parties with knives drawn, the very foundations of the state shook. The court accepted all the charges made by the journalist as justified, except for one - association with the Nazis with intent to pillage victims - and acquitted him. It meant the condemnation of Kasztner and Mr. Ben Gurion's party, to which he belonged, was discredited. In the next legislative elections it lost an appreciable number of seats, although it still kept an absolute majority.

It therefore became necessary to reverse the situation before the oncoming elections. Kasztner appealed and the trial was taken up before the Supreme Court of Appeals on January 20th, 1957. It was a repetition of the earlier trial - but worse. Influenced or not by Ben Gurion's government, against which a current of hostile opinion, fed by the proceedings, was growing, the Supreme Court immediately made its conviction apparent that the journalist had to be found guilty in order to fend off any danger that Ben Gurion's party might find itself in a minority, and public opinion reacted favourably to this. On March 5th, 1957, two months after the trial began, the hearings were threatening to go on for a long time and spread disorder in the state, and perhaps create a national crisis. Coincidentally, just as he was leaving the 44th session, Kasztner was seriously wounded by a terrorist on the very steps of the Law Courts; a terrorist whose hand had been armed by the violent language - and perhaps in a material way, too - of the extreme right. (The extreme right and the extreme left operated a loose coalition against Ben Gurion.) Kasztner died a few days later.

[102]

The trial thus came to an end to the great relief of everyone, Kasztner's assassin was not unduly bothered. In August 1958 Kasztner was rehabilitated in a judgement which did not censure his denouncer. The affair was spoken of no more, in an atmosphere, if not of restored national unity, at least one purged by this "Solomon's judgement" of its poisoning miasma. Not wishing to stir up any discord, both sides easily fell into agreement on the necessity not to make the Kasztner Report public - that is, not to put it in book form - in the interests of the state.

Then came the Eichmann Trial. In order to clear Becher, Kaltenbrunner had laid all the responsibility for the deportation and its horrors on Eichmann. The Kasztner Report therefore became a principal testimony, with the agreement of the Israeli government. Kasztner's beneficiaries then published his report, through Kindler at Munich, with a preface by Professor Carlo Schmid, socialist deputy to the Bundestag. Nothing was to be neglected to justify the condemnation of Eichmann in the eyes of world opinion. But, as it stood, the Kasztner Report could be used by a clever lawyer to clear Eichmann because it distinctly cast a doubt on the official version of the treatment of the Jews in the concentration camps and, particularly, on the very existence of gas exterminations, attributed to Auschwitz. So it had to be somewhat modified. They did not shrink from the task.

Here, taken from a photocopy I made myself from one of the copies of the original edition, which I had in my possession, is what the Kasztner Report has to say about gas chambers at Auschwitz:

"chen, vielleicht um Tage handeln. Meldungen aus Bratislava bestätigen auch diese Befürchtungen. Die dortige Vanda leitete uns die Meldungen ihres Nachrichtendienstes weiter. Demgemäss war die S.S. im Begriffe, die Gaskammern und Krematorien in Auschwitz, die seit dem Herbst 1943 ausser Gebrauch waren auszubessern und zurenovieren. Man erholte die Zahi der Mannschaft, und einer der Unteroffiziere soll sich die Aeusserung geleistet haben: "Bald essen wir feine ungarische Salami." (Er dachte hier allerdings an die mitgebrachten Lebensmittel der Juden.) "

"perhaps for days negotiate. Reports from Bratislava also confirm these fears. The Vandah there further directs to us the reports of its news service. According to these reports the S.S. *were about to renovate and restore the gas chambers and crematoria at Auschwitz, which since autumn 1943 had been out of use*. They increased the number of troops and one of the subalterns is supposed to have said, "Soon we eat fine Hungarian Salami." (Here he was thinking, to be sure, of the victuals the Jews brought with them.)"

Dr. Kasztner did not say, as we know, that the gas chambers at Auschwitz-Birkenau were a pure invention, but only that they had not been working "since the autumn of 1943." Since the [103] event he was reporting took place in May 1944, and since the official version was that they were not put into service until February 20th, 1943, these 8 or 9 months of interruption considerably shortened the amount of time the S.S. had to dispose of 4 to 4,5 million people, the figure customarily given at the time.

And this is the way the above passage was rendered in the Kindler edition, prefaced by Carlo Schmid (likewise a photocopy):

"Meldungen aus Pressburg bestätigen diese Befürchtungen. Das dortige Komitee leitete uns die Meldungen seines Nachrichtendienstes weiter. Damgemäss war die S.S. in begriff, die Gaskammern und Krematorien in Auschwitz auszubessern und zu renovieren. Die Zahl der Mannschaften wurde erhöht, und einer der Scharfführer soll sich die Ausserung geleistet haben: "Bald essen wir feine ungarische Salami." Er dachte hierbei offenkundig an die mitgebrachten Lebensmittel der Juden."

On the treatment to which the Jews were subjected in the Theresienstadt concentration camp, the original Report contained a letter signed by 6 Jews interned in that camp which, although it was surely not the case in all camps for all Jews, no less surely shows that the authorities of the Third Reich had decided that that is what it should have been everywhere.

"The letter is in answer to one received on 8 May from Chawer. The senders are pleased to answer and request Chawer to greet all their friends. The senders are pleased to learn from Chawer's letter that the countless parcels from Lisbon and Istanbul are the work of their friends. Friends from Vienna who live together with them in Theresienstadt have also received parcels from the above named places. Although the welfare situation is thoroughly organised and occasions no worry of any kind, we enjoy always receiving these parcels because we view them as indications of your friendship.

The letter then describes the life and organisation of the place.

"In Theresienstadt a truly Jewish city has arisen in which all work is taken care of by Jews, beginning with street cleaning all the way up to a modern health system with hospitals, a staff of doctors, nurses, helpers, from technical work to caring for the community kitchen, from our own police and fire department to a special system of courts, post and transport, from a bank with its own settlement money and from shops selling food, clothing and household utensils, to leisure time installations in which regular lectures, theatre performances and concerts take place. The children of whom special care is taken, are in children's and youth homes, the old people in homes under medical observation and care. Those who are able to work are assigned to domestic service. Excellent specialists have come together from all areas, not only administrative, technical and sanitary, but also those who in leisure time can contribute to a rich cultural life, Jewish and general. A library of 50,000 volumes with several reading rooms, a coffee house with music serving as a diversion, especially for older people. A central bath and clothes washing place furthers the [104] general hygiene upon which naturally special value is put. So one can feel thoroughly comfortable here. The letterhead shows you a view of the city. The health situation is throughout favourable, thanks to the unhindered work of our doctors, the extensive provision of food and medicines, and the climatic conditions of Theresienstadt."

As far as I know this letter has never been made public and, naturally, the Kindler at Munich edition of the Kasztner Report does not contain it!

Is this the last of the surprises in store for us relative to the Auschwitz camp and the treatment of Jews in others? I hardly think so, especially in connection with Auschwitz. In Germany at the moment, the commandant who replaced Hoess as director of the camp, has been

in prison for two years. His trial is postponed every two or three months because, if the prosecutor can prove (leaning on Hoess' testimony alone!!) that the gas chambers were in operation there from February 20th, 1943 to the "autumn of 1943" (say for 6 to 7 months), he is contradicted by Kasztner for the period "autumn 1943 - May 1944," and cannot prove that they were put back in use from May to October 1944, which is the date everyone has agreed they were destroyed (if indeed, they were ever built!). Will he succeed? It is not likely. In 1963 the mentality of the witnesses is not what it was in 1946. Among all those witnesses whom Prosecuting Attorney Bauer (he is the one setting up the trial of the second commandant of Auschwitz, predestined to the job by his name) has found, the only reliable ones state unanimously that during the time they were in the camp, between the autumn of 1943 and the autumn of 1944, they never saw the gas chambers in operation, although - surprise! surprise! - not one of them denies their existence (!). Prosecutor Bauer must be really out of luck because, given the progress in techniques, he should be able to find witnesses for the prosecution. In Bonn, another attorney, far less endowed with the virtuosity of Bauer, was easily able to find witnesses to attest to the existence of the "buses" used for the same work. They contradict each other, and they contradict all those we have heard up to now, but people are not that difficult!

It will be serious if he does not find any witnesses because, even if the testimony of Hoess were indisputable, there is at least one piece of evidence that is just as indisputable. That is that not one of the "437,000 Hungarian Jews deported to Auschwitz" in the official version was gassed.

On top of all the other blows, this one could be fatal for Jewish extermination statistics.

* * *

If the historian now looks over the extent of the damage, that is, the figure used to determine the dimensions of the crime, he is [105] neither happier nor less perplexed, for this reason: If it is agreed in political circles in the world that six million Jews were exterminated - and how can that monstrous slaughter be explained except by the use of such drastic measures as gas chambers? - the statistics revealed by the documents are far from corroborating this evaluation.

On November 21st, 1945, at Nuremberg, Justice Jackson, plaintiff, expressed himself in this way:

"Of the 9,600,000 Jews who lived in that part of Europe dominated by the Nazis, it is estimated on good grounds that 60% of their number perished. 5,700,000 Jews are missing in those countries where they lived before, and more than 4,500,000 cannot be accounted for by the normal death rate, or by immigration into other countries. " (Volume 11, p. 128.)

Such, then, was the charge: 4,500,000.

The court did not sustain this figure and, from then on, everyone felt free to estimate the number of victims as his imagination or fantasy dictated. Even during the hearings, Sir David Maxwell-Fyfe, British prosecutor, interrogating Goering on March 21st, 1946, gave the green light to the most senseless estimations in saying to him: "It has been proved that approximately 10,000,000 Jews and other persons were massacred in cold blood, not counting those killed in battle."

The press heard, and transmitted "10,000,000 Jews . That was a little too much. The Billigs, the Poliakovs, Alexandrovs, Jacob Lechtinskys, Shalom Barons (holder of the chair of Jewish History at Columbia University) etc., indulged in speculations of the dizziest kind, to place the figure somewhere between the lowest, 4,500,000, given by Justice Jackson, and the highest, 10,000,000, tendentiously taken from Sir David Maxwell-Fyfe's statement, and they arrived at 6,000,000 for the number of Jews exterminated, which is close enough - remarkably - to the mathematical average of the two. To give the impression that the question had been

seriously studied, some of them specified that four to four and a half million had been exterminated at Auschwitz-Birkenau, and the rest in other camps or in other circumstances.

And since then these figures have been served up nearly every morning for breakfast, all over the world, in the morning papers, it not in so many words at least in close variations. The most modest of those who have studied the problem, the British publicist Gerald Reitlinger (*The Final Solution*, London, 1956), contented himself with a figure which in its totality lies "between 4,200,000 and 4,600,000." Dr. Hans Gunther Seraphim, statistician and librarian at the University of Göttingen, says "about 4,500,000 Jews." But, to offset that, M. Léon Poliakov ends a study he has been making (*Revue d'Histoire de la seconde guerre mondiale*, October 1956, p. 90) with the following estimate, the sensational nature of which is inescapable:

"It can be said with virtual certainty that the number of Jews[106] exterminated should lie between 5 to 7 million, 6 million being the most probable, a figure including only deaths by violence, asphyxiation or execution, and not taking into account at all the demographic deficit added between 1939 and 1945 from the almost total absence of births in Jewish homes... Doubtless professional statisticians, working with the help of demographic methods, which they will bring in, would conclude in these conditions that the "actual losses" in the Jewish world between 1933 and 1945 were about 8 million. "

M. Léon Poliakov is too modest. I am sure that in counting as exterminated all the Jews that were not born between 1933 and 1945 it would not take much effort to arrive at many, many more than 8 million.

In short, the figure almost unanimously accepted in support of germanophobic publicity is 6 million. For Auschwitz-Birkenau the press sticks to 4 million, although the Krakow tribunal which sentenced Hoess, the first commandant, to be hanged on April 4th, 1947, gave 2,500,000, and the Institute of Jewish Affairs, World Jewish Congress (*Eichmann's Confederates and the Third Reich Hierarchy*, N.Y., 28 E. 84th St., 1961, p. 18) gave only 900,000.

The latest commentator specialising in German horrors and atrocities, M. Raul Hilberg (*The Destruction of the European Jews*, Quadrangle Books, Inc., Chicago, 1961), devoted himself to learned calculations to arrive at a total of 5,100,000, a million at Auschwitz-Birkenau, the rest exterminated in other camps (Chelmno, Belzec, Sobibor, Maideneck and Treblinka) by the Einsatzgruppen during the advance and retreat of German troops in Russia.

M. Léon Poliakov enumerated six statistical methods which all led, although by different ways, to the extermination of a number of Jews more or less close to six million. Each one of these methods is in itself a veritable puzzle, so that a historian in search of the truth finds himself faced with a puzzle of puzzles.

The reader will excuse me if I thought that, under such circumstances, the truth could not be found except through a detailed statistical study, and I have devoted a special chapter to it later in this work. I will confine myself here to a summary of the matter. Even if the Germans had decided to exterminate the European Jews, the validity of which is disputed in the documents cited above and by the avowal of Dr. Kubovy, Director of the Centre of Contemporary Jewish Documentation at Tel Aviv, they could never have exterminated six million, or even five, for the simple reason that there never were six million Jews, or even five - far from that - in that part of Europe occupied by their troops during the war; that those who were there were by no means all arrested; and that those who were arrested were by no means all exterminated.

If the reader would like to have an idea of the magnitude of the macabre exaggerations made by all those imaginative writers, [107] one example will suffice. At Nuremberg, the French Prosecutor general Dubost, claimed in his indictment (the exact text will be found in the chapter dealing with this matter) pronounced on January 29th, 1946, that 250,000 French had been deported to Germany. On February 24th, 1962, the French Minister of Veterans and War Victims, gave the exact figure - 49,135. In other words, the prosecutor had multiplied the actual number by 5. I will show that in the calculations of Poliakov, Hilberg and Co., there are innumerable exaggerations of the general total. For example, the 4 millions of Auschwitz-

Birkenau (according to the *Revue d'Histoire de la seconde guerre mondiale*, October 1956, p. 3) were reduced to 900,000 by the Institute of Jewish Affairs (*op. cit.* p. 18).

But everything in its place. This chapter is addressed to another question.

* * *

The reader might ask himself, if the existence of gas chambers has not been established, and if the number of deaths could be brought down from 6 million to 1 million, what was the significance of that concentration of Jews in special camps, and how did the idea of gas chambers arise?

Here, then:

Hitlerian Germany was a racist state, and that is the answer to the first part of the question. The racist state, however, postulates the expulsion of the minority race beyond the frontiers of the national community. The State of Israel is another illustration.

"Only a compatriot," stated Article 4 of the programme of the National Socialist Party, made public on February 24th, 1920 at Munich, "can be a citizen. Only he who is of German blood, regardless of his faith, can be a compatriot. A Jew cannot be a compatriot..."

The word used in the original is *Volkgenosse* for "kinsman," which has no corresponding word in French, or in any other language. "Kinsman" or "compatriot" is only an approximate translation. One should say "comrade of the people," or "one belonging to the people." The difficulty lies in the fact that the word *Volk* in German does not just mean "people," but includes "the blood" and "the soil" associated with the idea of a people.

Article 5 concluded: "He who is not a citizen may not live in Germany except as a guest, and is under the jurisdiction of legislation pertaining to foreigners."

When National Socialism came to power on January 30th, 1933, the German Jews thus found themselves automatically endowed with the status of aliens which, in all countries, excludes them from holding top positions in the government or in the economy. This was the juridical basis of the race laws in Hitlerian Germany.

[108]

That there is no moral justification for such a measure is quite evident and there is no need to prove it. But then, the fact that in no country in the world is an alien given a post of command is not the question. The only difference between Hitlerian Germany and the other countries was that, in other countries one is an alien by virtue of nationality, while in the eyes of National Socialism, one was an alien by virtue of race. But in Israel there are no Arabs who are schoolmasters, finance administrators or administrators of a Kibbutz, or Ministers. What takes place in Israel does not justify what took place in Germany, I repeat - if only because one cannot justify one wrong with another. But I am not justifying, I am explaining, and to explain I have to take apart the mechanism. If I cite Israel it is only to show that the racist evil, in the sense in which National Socialism understood racist, is much greater than one thinks, since the champions of anti-racism there are today racism's protagonists, and only to point out that, contrary to what is generally believed, Hitlerian Germany is not the only example.

As a matter of fact and not of principle, there is still another difference between Germany and Israel. In 1933, the 500,000 Jews who were living in Germany, who *de jure* were put outside the national community, could not be put out *de facto*, by leading them on route marches to one or another of the frontiers, with or without the legendary 30 kilos of baggage, as Israel did with the 900,000 Arabs of Palestine, who were pushed into Jordan in 1948. With her modern well-organised states, with well defined frontiers, all maintaining very formal political and economic relations with each other, the Europe of 1933 did not offer the same opportunities to a racist state as did the Middle East of 1948, composed as it was of embryonic states with poorly defined frontiers and without any mutual relations, except those governed by the laws of the jungle. The passage of individuals from one country to another was controlled by

immigration laws, and when it was a question of massive immigration, as in the case of the German Jews, it was called a Population Transfer, and preliminary negotiations were necessary.

The Nazi government wanted to engage in such negotiations first of all, on the basis of the Balfour Declaration, with Britain, to which the Treaty of Versailles had given a mandate over Palestine, where the international Zionist movement clamoured for the reestablishment of the Biblical Jewish State, within its rights.

This is the text of the Balfour Declaration (November 2nd, 1917).

"The government of his Britannic Majesty look favourably on the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people, and will do all in their power to favour the achievement of this purpose, it being well understood that nothing will be done to prejudice the civil and religious rights of the non-Jewish communities in Palestine, nor to the rights and status which the Jews enjoy in other lands."

[109]

To maintain that this declaration was bound to result in the creation of the State of Israel, in the conditions under which it was created, and to its support in the conditions in which it actually exists, is meaningless. That is also the opinion of the celebrated British historian, Arnold Toynbee, and of many other academics, Jewish and non-Jewish. In any case, it was a Utopian dream and the creation of this Jewish state in 1948 proved it. At the time, Arabs, hostile - and they still are - to this interpretation of the Balfour Declaration, tried to limit its applications, indeed, to stop them, and for reasons of oil, Britain did not affront them. She did not want to have any direct contact with Germany over the settlement of this problem, and directed her to the Jewish agency of Mr. Chaim Weizmann, with which she was involved through the Balfour Declaration. For her part, the Germany of Hitler who, like the Germany of the Weimar Republic and the Germany of the Kaisers, was determined to cultivate commercial popularity with the Arab peoples, did not insist. She put the problem on a much broader plan than the Palestinian plan with the Jewish agency, but succeeded in reaching only one agreement in 1933 - called the Chaim Arlossaroff's Transfer-Abkommen by the Germans, the Hawara by the Jews - which envisaged the immigration into Palestine of *all* Jews able to arrive there with £1,000 sterling, but which limited immigration to 1,500 Jews per month for at the others. (In *Le Bréviaire de la Haine*, p. 32, M. Léon Poliakov notes this agreement, but twists the sense.) Such were the conditions imposed by Britain on the Jewish agency, and that was the limit of what she could consent to in order not to offend the Arab peoples of the Middle East.

This 91,000 per Jew stipulation finally constituted the whole problem. There were about 500,000 Jews in Germany and they represented in the aggregate the export of £500 million, or approximately 10 billion marks. This was very close to the evaluation that Dr. Schacht gave of the total fortune of the 500,000 German Jews. No negotiations were undertaken over the sum, however, because another difficulty had to be surmounted. Hitlerian Germany declared that it was impossible to export such a lot of capital all at once because it corresponded to more than half the amount of the annual budget. She asked that settlement be future-dated, on the basis of economic agreements of compensation, not only with Britain - involved because of Palestine - but also with any other nation. These other nations and Britain made it clearly understood that if they were prepared to receive the German Jews, and even to contemplate a lesser (but not much less) sum than the fixed average of 11,000 per head, they would not find it possible to enter into any negotiation whatsoever unless Germany first pledged that the Jews would be allowed to take with them whatever sum they agreed upon. Everything collapsed. The last attempt of this kind was made in November 1938. Although already in disfavour, Schacht was commissioned by [110] Hitler and went personally to London. In vain.

It was however correct that in 1933, Germany could not export, without compensation agreements and time extensions, the sum of 10 billion marks. At that time neither France, Britain - nor even possibly the United States - could have.

So this is what happened. From 1933 the Jewish Agency was authorised to open a central office in Berlin for Jewish emigration (*Zentralstelle für jüdische Auswanderung*) to distribute,

under Nazi control, the 1,500 monthly passports for Palestine, as authorised by Britain. Insofar as no compensation agreement could be reached, no passport could be issued which allowed the export of the value in exchange of £1,000. For the others, however, the Jewish Agency and the Nazis together agreed to push things a little by distributing more than 1,500 passports (mainly under the cover of assumed nationalities). Then again, the Nazis facilitated a steady, clandestine emigration, to such an extent that when war was declared, about 300,000 - and not just the 108,000 Jews authorised by the Chaim-Arlossaroff's Transfer Abkommen or Hawara - had succeeded in leaving Germany.

On the declaration of war another complication arose, and the business nearly came to an abrupt stop. In March 1939, Britain had decided to grant, flatly, no more than 75,000 emigration authorisations for the next five years.

This little known aspect, carefully kept under cover by the "historians" of the Centre for Contemporary Jewish Documentation - and a few others too! - is revealed in a certain number of documents, especially those carrying the reference N.G. 1889 (Note of the Foreign Affairs Ministry, dated March 10th, 1938, produced at the Wilhelmstrasse trial) and P.S. 3558 (Report of the same Ministry, dated January 25th, 1939, produced at the first Nuremberg Trial).

Throughout this period, "the régime inflicted on the German Jews by the government was that of a minority out of favour and humiliated," M. Joseph Billig of the Centre for Contemporary Jewish Documentation tells us. Further on he adds that "the activity of the Jews in the German economy was not seriously hampered," and as far as the Austrian Jews who fell under the power of the Nazis through the Anschluss were concerned, "it was a question again of a fairly inoffensive action."

Considering that it was precisely during this period that all the racist legislative measures publicly promulgated at the Nuremberg Congress of the Nazi Party on September 15th, 1935 were taken against the Jews, and in the light of the mountain of indignant and vengeful literature which these racist measures provoked in the world, this very temperate judgement from an Israeli pen cannot fail to surprise us. Inadvertence?

In November 1938 everything changed abruptly. The assassination in Paris on the 7th of that month of Counsellor of the Embassy, von Rath, by a young Jew named Grynszpan, provoked [111] that night of horror and nightmare in Germany, November 9-10, 1938 - a veritable Jew hunt; the pillage and sacking of their stores; the smashing of their windows - hence the name *Kristallnacht* (Crystal Night) as it was called by the Germans; limitless and numberless molestations; the pillage and destruction of 815 stores, 171 houses, 276 synagogues, 14 other monuments of the community; 20,000 Jews arrested, 7 Germans, 3 foreigners; 36 killed and 36 wounded. (Report of Heydrich to Goering, dated November 11th, 1938. Volume IX, pp. 554. Document acknowledged as authentic by Goering and all the other defendants against whom it was produced).

On the conditions under which these manifestations took place we have only one official and sure document: Document P.S. 3063, dated February 13th, 1939, Volume XXXII, pp. 20-29. This was the report of the highest judge of the National Socialist Party, Walter Buch, in charge of the inquiry and tribunal to judge the 174 members of the Party arrested after the 11th of November on orders from Heydrich for having organised it and having participated. These 174 persons were all of the subaltern ranks. The leaders, the government, the defendants and the Führer only learned about it after it had happened. They all disavowed it, except for Goebbels who, learning of it afterwards like the others, and not having taken part, was pleased about it.

It was Goebbels in fact who heard about it first. On the 9th of November, 1938 - as every year - the heads of the Party met together in Munich to commemorate the putsch of 1923. Late in the evening, Goebbels was informed by telegraph that serious antisemitic demonstrations were taking place in Hesse, Magdeburg and on a smaller scale all over Germany. After a brief conversation among the principal dignitaries of the Party and the Führer, a telegram was sent by Heydrich at 1.20 in the morning to all the police bureaux all over Germany (Document P.S. 3051, Volume XXXI, pp. 515-519). He called upon all the police commissioners to make contact at once with the district Party staffs, to see to it that Jews were not molested, that their

lives and property were not threatened, that their stores and living quarters were not pillaged etc. - in short, that things should continue to develop with order and that calm should be restored. Now this is how this telegram, whose purpose was to put an end to unexpected demonstrations because they were contrary to the spirit of National Socialism as well as of the government, was presented to the Tribunal at Nuremberg on November 21st, 1945 by Justice Jackson himself, in the inaugural session:

"The anti-Semitic campaign became frenzied in Germany after the assassination at Paris of German counsellor of the legation von Rath. Heydrich, head of the Gestapo, sent a telegram to all the officers of the Gestapo and S.D. ordering them to arrange a "spontaneous" protest for the nights of November 9 and 10, 1938, to hasten the destruction of Jewish goods and to protect [112] German goods alone... 19 (Volume II, p. 130).

One wonders at: a) the plural... "the nights of the 9th and 10th, instead of the night of November 9-10; b) that this telegram which "orders" (*sic*) demonstrations for that night is specifically dated 1.20 a.m. of the 10th; c) that it "orders" that he wants a stop put to the manner in which the demonstrations were developing.

Thus are legends born.

But the Crystal Night was not the only consequence of the assassination of von Rath. Because of the gravity of the troubles it provoked and therefore the need to avoid any repetition of such, this assassination made the directors of the Third Reich realise that an overall solution to the Jewish problem had to be found. It had been dragging on for five years but now, to describe their new approach, they entitled it *die Endlösung der Judenfrage* - a phrase to which for fifteen years the disoriented imaginations of all the drifting journalists and the unusual historians of the Jewish Centre for Contemporary Documentation have given so many other and false meanings.

Actually the original phrase was *die Gesamtlösung der Judenfrage*, or the solution of the whole, all, so that the question could not be reopened. But Goering, who used it for the first time in the first paragraph of a letter to Heydrich dated July 31st, 1941, in which he gave the order to make preparations for it (P.S. 710, Volume XXVI, p. 266), used the expression *die Endlösung der Judenfrage* in the last paragraph, and this is the phrase which prevailed. It had the same meaning as the original title and did not mean the liquidation of the problem by the liquidation of the people concerned. Picked up by Goering himself, in the act of using a tendentious translation at Nuremberg on March 20th, 1946, poor Justice Jackson was obliged to acknowledge it (Volume IX, p. 552). But the press never breathed a word of this and so a whole concept was twisted forever.

While Dr. Schacht was packing his bags to go to London on Hitler's orders to try to renew negotiations with Britain and a certain number of other countries which had been almost dead since 1933 and which an international conference convoked at Evian on July 6th, 1938, at President Roosevelt's initiative had failed to revive, Goering - also armed with a mandate from Hitler - convened an inter-ministerial conference of representatives from all the ministries of the Third Reich affected by measures to be taken without delay. Apart from Goering, who presided, amongst others at the conference were Goebbels, (Propaganda Minister), Heydrich (head of the R.S.H.A., representing Himmler), Frick (Minister of the Interior), Funk (Minister of Economics), Schwerin-Krosigk (Minister of Finance) etc. Opening the session, Goering stated:

"Gentlemen, I have had enough of these demonstrations that do not harm the Jews but do harm me, the highest authority of the [113] German economy. If today a Jewish shop is destroyed and the goods are thrown into the street, the insurance company will pay damages to the Jew so that he will suffer no loss. In addition, consumer goods, goods which belong to the people, are destroyed. If, in the future, such demonstrations take place, if they are necessary, then I demand that they be controlled in such a way as not to do us harm. And I want things done in such a way that they do not inflict damage on themselves; it would be crazy to empty and set fire to a Jewish store because that would be injurious to the insurance company, since they would have to cover the damages and pay for the merchandise. One

might as well seize and burn the goods at the moment they are delivered." (P.S. 1816, Volume XXVIII, pp. 499-540, and Volume IX, p. 561).

A certain Herr Hilgard, representative of the insurance companies, was also heard at this conference. He estimated the material damages for the windows and jewels alone (goods imported into Germany with resultant export of capital) at more than 25 million marks. He further detailed that the Belgian company which alone could repair the window frames, was asking for a six months time extension just to manufacture the necessary amount of glass. He added that he did not yet have to hand all the other factors of the disaster, at which Heydrich said that the total could be estimated at 100 million marks. And the experts in their turn showed that he had not exaggerated.

A discussion about the organisation of a massive emigration of Jews came to nothing. Goering did not think that it was practically possible because of the massive export of capital it would involve, nor did he see any chance of getting any import-export compensation agreements from other countries.

The reader is doubtless indignant that the Nazis refused to contemplate such a massive exodus of German Jews, allowing them to take with them the exchange value of all they possessed. It was indeed a crying injustice. But it was also an established practice and characteristic of all population transfers. I refer him to two works: *European Population Transfer* (Oxford Univ., 1946), and *Les Transferts internationaux de populations* (Presses universitaires de France), where he can note at his ease a good twenty such transfers determined by treaty, which required that the unfortunates involved leave their country with 30 kilos of baggage, often less, and always without money. Between July 1st, 1945 and January 1st, 1947 the Russians drove about 7,300,000 persons out of Silesia into Germany. They used cattle cars, allowed them far less than 30 kilos of baggage per person and not even any food for a journey of four to five days. In the *Revue des Deux Mondes* of May 15th, 1952, p. 374, M. Jean de Pange claims that more than 4 million died during the transfer, which thus amounts to a number of victims much greater than the Jewish victims in the concentration camps! And in full peacetime! We are certainly concerned with a human problem here, but it is also an [114] economic problem and, seen in that light, transfers of national wealth were involved which the very structure of international exchange does not permit unless coupled with compensations, without which the economy of the country would be ruined. Thus inhumanity arises from structures, not men, and then the chances to rebuild those structures - and the will to do so - alas, are very limited.

At any rate, the Germans had to wait for the results of Dr. Schacht's last attempt to renew international negotiations, and we have already seen that it foundered.

The principle of the three decrees which Goering would support was then laid down:

- The first, which would levy a collective tax of a billion marks on German Jews (P.S. 1412, Reichsgesetzblatt, 1938, pt. 1, p. 1579);
- The second, which would exclude Jews from German economic life (P.S. 2875 Reichsgesetzblatt, 1938, pt. 1, p. 1580);
- The last, deciding that the insurance companies would pay to the state, not to Jewish interests, the reimbursement for the damages of the Crystal Night (P.S. 2694 Reichsgesetzblatt, 1938, pt. 1, p. 1581).

The assassination thus brought about results analogous to those brought about later, during the German occupation of France, by those singular Resistants who provoked only the arrest of hundreds of hostages and a penalty for breaking the occupation ordinance, when they blew up a chemist shop or a cafe with a plastic bomb - more often than not to satisfy an old personal grudge - or assassinated a German soldier in a dark and deserted street etc., under the pretext of combatting Germany or Nazism. After November 7th, 1938, the life of the German Jews, which international negotiations on reasonable propositions would have saved, was made even more difficult by their exclusion from the economic life of Germany, and the consequences of that - the sequestration of Jewish goods and the expropriations in particular.

In 1939 another event put an end to any plans: war. All the more so because on September 5th - two days after the British and French declarations of war on Germany - Mr. Chaim Weizmann, President of the Jewish Agency, wrote a letter to Mr. Chamberlain, Prime Minister of His Majesty the King of England, in which he informed him, "We Jews are on Great Britain's side and will fight for Democracy," specifying that "the Jewish representatives were ready to conclude an agreement to permit the use of all their manpower, their techniques, their material aid and all their skills."

Perhaps I have not searched hard enough, but I have not found the text of this letter in any French publication.

Here is the passage in question, according to H. G. Adler in his *Die Verheimlich Wahrheit*, p. 320 (The Unknown Truth):

"Ich wünsche in nachdrücklichster Form die Erklärung zu[115]bestätigen, dass wir Juden an der Seite Grossbritanniens stehen und für die Demokratie kämpfen werden. Aus diesen Gründe stellen wir uns in den kleinsten und grössten Dingen unter die zusammenfassende Leitung der britischen Regierung. Die jüdische Vertretung ist bereit, in sofortige Abkommen einzustreten - und alle menschliche Kraft, ihre Technik, ihre Hilfsmittel und alle Fähigkeiten nützlich einzusetzen. " Der englische. Originaltext dieser Erklärung wird bei Adler (a.a.O.s. 321) wie folgt wiedergegeben:

"I wish to confirm in the most explicit manner, the declaration which I and my colleagues (sic) made during the last months and especially in the last week; that the Jews stand by Great Britain and will fight on the side of the democracies. Our urgent desire is to give effect to these declarations. We wish to do so in a way entirely consonant with the general scheme of British action, and therefore would place ourselves, in matters big and small, under the co-ordinating direction of His Majesty's Government. The Jewish (sic) Agency is ready to enter (sic) into immediate arrangements of utilising Jewish manpower, technical ability, resources, etc. "

Reproduced in the *Jewish Chronicle* of October 8th, 1939, this letter constituted a real declaration of war on Germany by the Jewish world and created the problem of the internment of all the German Jews in concentration camps as "nationals of a nation at war with Germany." That is another step taken by all countries of the world in wartime. It must, however, be recognised that even before the publication of this letter, the German government had already made preparations in this direction. After all, the declaration of war on Germany, not only by Chaim Weizmann, but especially by Britain and France, put an end to all projects for the transfer of Jews on any negotiated basis whatsoever.

After the defeat of France and the failure of peace feelers offered to Britain, the idea grew in the minds of the Nazi leaders that the Jews could be gathered together, then transferred to a French colonial territory, for example, Madagascar. A report dated August 21st, 1942, signed by Luther, Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs of the Third Reich, concluded on the possibility of negotiations with France about this and mentioned conversations which took place from July to December 1940, the failure of which, after the interview at Montoir on October 24th, 1940, was sought about by Pierre-Etienne Flandin, Laval's successor. During the whole of 1941, the Germans clung to the hope of taking up these negotiations again and bringing them to a successful conclusion. (From Document N.G. 2586 - the same in which the celebrated Wannsee Protocol appears - produced at the Wilhelmstrasse trial. M. Billig also cites it in the Eichmann dossier. And V. Alexandrov romances these negotiations in the book that he, too, wrote on Eichmann.)

"In March 1941," Hoess tells us (Autobiography, p. 153), [116] "Himmler confided to him his decision to change the camp at Auschwitz-Birkenau into 'a mighty armament works; a camp for 100,000 war prisoners, an enlargement of the former camp for 30,000 prisoners, preparation of 10,000 prisoners for Buna...' At the time, Hoess comments, "those were figures absolutely unheard of in the history of the camps. At that date, a camp of 10,000 prisoners was already considered immense." (Cited from Michel Borwicz, expert before the Tribunal of the Polish High Court, for the trials of war criminals, in "Les Solutions Finales", published in *Revue d'Histoire de la seconde guerre mondiale*, October 1956, p. 59.)

If it is true, as claimed, that the Germans really did foster the idea of exterminating the Jews, the idea had not yet occurred to them at that date and this text proves it, doubtless inadvertently furnished by the accusers themselves. And this proof is corroborated by the report of Luther cited above, wherein it said that at that date the Germans were hoping to arrive at an agreement with France to gather together all the Jews on Madagascar, on the resumption of the diplomatic conversations broken off in December 1940.

It was during the second half of 1941 that the solution of the Jewish problem took a murderous turn. First there was the declaration of war on Russia. Goebbels had the rumour spread that Hitler had been compelled to do it because the Jews were trying to get Stalin into the war. Then followed the famous book, *Germany Must Perish* (Argyle Press, Newark, N.J., 1941) by a certain Theodore N. Kaufman, an American Jew of whom it can be said that his voice was the tocsin of the forthcoming entry of the United States into the war at the side of Britain, France and Russia.

Theodore N. Kaufman said bluntly in his book that the Germans, for the very fact that they were German - be they anti-Nazi Germans, even communists or philosemites - did not deserve to live, and that after the war 20,000 doctors would be mobilised to sterilise 25 German men or women a day, so that in three months there would not be a single German capable of reproducing in Europe, and in 60 years the German race would be totally eliminated from the continent. He further said that the German Jews were of this opinion also.

The fact that Theodore N. Kaufman was not brought before the Nuremberg Trial after having dared to write such things is not the point I wish to stress. There is worse.

Hitler ordered the book to be read over all the radio stations and one can imagine the effect it produced on German opinion. I have myself met Germans who told me that from that day on, when they learned about this scheme, everyone - people, army, police - everywhere, began to talk about the necessity to literally exterminate the Jews and expressed the hope that Hitler would issue an order to that effect. And the word was passed that such [117] an order had been given by Hitler to Himmler or Heydrich. There were people who claimed to be well informed who said that they heard it from someone high up, and when a Jew fell into the hands of some dull-witted policeman, who had heard the rumour and firmly believed it, his fate was certainly not enviable.

At Nuremberg, Minister Lammers, Secretary of the Reich Chancellery, confirmed this, saying, "My opinion is that these rumours (often passing for orders) came from clandestine radio listening posts, where foreign broadcasts were heard, and that no one wanted to admit that." (Volume XI, p. 58)

The reading of Theodore Kaufman's book over the radio unleashed a mass fury against the Jews, regardless of the influence of the foreign broadcasts. But all Germany also believed the foreign broadcasts, which were listened to secretly, and, believing that an order had been given, many of those sorry S.S. types surely thought that they were authorised to carry the order out. In December 1941, when Germany had to go to war with the United States, it was the last straw.

Actually, before the war with the United States, there was a general, vague sort of feeling all round that some solution other than the Madagascar one had to be found for the Jews, and that they would have to be kept in Europe until the end of the war. Goering's letter to Heydrich of July 31st, 1941, already referred to, doubtless reflected this feeling. The deportation of the Jews to the East had begun on October 15th, 1941. Heydrich's summons to the Berlin-Wannsee meeting, dated November 29th, 1941, originally set the meeting for December 9th, but events forced its postponement to January 20th, 1942. The purpose of the meeting was precisely to plan out the concentration of the Jews in the East. The real mass deportation of all European Jews to Auschwitz-Birkenau and the other Polish camps began in March 1942.

From France, M. Joseph Billig tells us ("La Condition des Juifs en France sous l'Occupation", published in *Revue d'Histoire de la seconde guerre mondiale*, October 1956, p. 40), "the first convoy for the East left on March 27th, 1941," but that "deportation in earnest did not begin until after a plan that was blocked was revised on June 11th, 1942, at the R.S.H.A. in Berlin" and implemented through a memorandum of the June 11th R.S.H.A.

meeting, signed Dannecker, on June 15th, 1942, "which determined the methods of deportation, not only for France, but for the whole of Europe."

If we consider that the last convoy to Auschwitz-Birkenau arrived on July 7th, 1944 (Hungarian Jews), and taking March 27th, 1942 for the departure of the first, it lasted 27 months, and that is the length of time given by the American psychologist Gustave Gilbert (Professor at Long Island) attached to the Nuremberg Trial (statement made on May 30th, 1961, before the Jerusalem Tribunal in judgement on Eichmann). My investigations reveal the same. Non-racist mass deportation began on the same [118] date and lasted approximately as long. The last convoy from France left on August 24th, 1944.

The synchronisation, and in particular the departure date, will be noticed; this coincides with the arrival of Speer at the Ministry of Armaments (February 1942). Mass deportations to relieve the manpower crisis which faced Germany from the second half of 1941 on, were the consequence. In Speer's mind there was no reason why Jews should not be put to work like the others, and many documents signed with his name attest to this. Another coincidence: we have a letter from Himmler, dated December 5th, 1941, addressed to Heydrich, to Pohl (head of the business office of the K.Z.) and to Ghicke (inspector general of the K.Z.) which notes the tendency to violence he had found among all the K.Z., and which requests of those concerned that a stop be put to this, without making any special reference to make an exception of Jews, and which contains these words: "...disagreement with certain specialists of the S.S., I will improve the diet of the K.Z., and turn all affected into good specialised workers..." (cited by Billig, *Eichmann Dossier*, p. 60). The year 1942 was marked by a quantity of letters emanating from the central offices of the R.S.H.A. and pointing to an improvement in the diet at all camps. In *The Commandant of Auschwitz Speaks*, Hoess cites Himmler himself as saying that he "wanted more and more special prisoners for the arms industry" (*op. cit.*, p. 225), and therefore these special prisoners (Jews) were handled accordingly.

We will see further on, in the study devoted to it, how Eugen Kogon cites another circular, dated December 28th, 1942, from the Central Bureau of Camp Management (Pohl), of the same nature concerning deportees as a whole. The orders stated that the Jews had been sent to special camps (*Sonderlagern*), which set up the special handling (*Sonderbehandlung*) which they were to receive, as compared with the deportation of their opposite numbers who were sent haphazardly to this camp or that. The deportation of the Jews to the East became in itself a special operation (*Sonderaktion*), that is, especially directed against them. All this was done in the atmosphere of hate created by Theodore N. Kaufman's book and the precipitation towards "total war" - an expression just then introduced into common vocabulary and which all Germans thought he had invented, for which he admitted he was preparing fellow members of his race. Everyone agrees that this deportation was brutal and murderous. The Jews never spoke of it among themselves except in terror, even before it happened to them. And when they had suffered it, the effects were intensified by apprehension over what was still to come. Hoess tells us that at Auschwitz, one entire sector of the camp, Auschwitz III (Monowitz), was given over to I.G. Farben; and this industry, which uses colouring matter and dyes, suggests gas chambers. Moreover, there were in the camp clothing disinfection rooms, an operation for which this very Zyklon B was used. It was [119] only one step from that to saying that these gas chambers were for the asphyxiation of Jews, which the prisoners of the camp itself took up, even faster than the historians of the Jewish Centre for Contemporary Documentation.- Every time they found the words *Sonderlager*, *Sonderbehandlung* or *Sonderaktion* in a text, they decreed on their own authority that it was code talk and referred to gas chambers.

As an argument it seems a little weak, to say the least, after considering the following incident:

On April 12th, 1945, Colonel Amen, American deputy prosecutor, having charged Kaltenbrunner with having requested the special treatment at Walsertal in the Walsertal, and at the Winzerstube at Godesberg, got the following reply:

"Do you know what Walsertal in the Walsertal or Winzerstube at Godesberg are, and their relation to what you call *Sonderbehandlung*? Walsertal is the most elegant and fashionable mountain hotel in all Germany, and the Winzerstube at Godesberg is a well-known hotel where many international conferences have been held. In those hotels such distinguished people as M. Poncet and M. Herriot, etc., were put. They received triple the rations allotted to ordinary diplomats, that is, nine times the wartime ration for a German. They received a bottle of champagne every day, corresponded freely with their families, or could receive parcels from them. These internees had frequent visitors and their wants were inquired after. That is what we called *Sonderbehandlung*. " (Volume XI, p. 248)

In these terms, the *Sonderbehandlung* which meant that the racial prisoners were sent to *Sonderlager*, and which distinguished them from the common run, also meant that prominent prisoners were distinguished from the common run in that they were not sent to concentration camps but to hotels. And that is quite far from the interpretation given - and still being given! - by the "historians" of the Jewish Centre for Contemporary Documentation.

What about witnesses? So far Hoess, the commandant of Auschwitz, has been produced, but we must question the value of his oral testimony (given at Nuremberg) as well as his written testimony (penned in his cell at Cracow) which we have already pointed out was written under threat of death, in the hope of reprieve or commutation of his sentence, and is full of contradictions between one page and the next. Gerstein? After writing (?) his testimony, he took the wise precaution of committing suicide. An analysis of his testimony will be found in my work *The Drama of the European Jews*, as well as the most plausible explanation of his suicide - or his assassination. There is also an analysis of the testimony given by the strange Dr. Miklos Nyiszli, who saw gas chambers 200 meters long and 1.05 to 2.55 meters wide in which by batches of 3,000, 10,000 persons a day were asphyxiated according to the German language edition, or 20,000 [120] in the French language edition!

The others? They put gas chambers which they "saw" themselves in camps where we know today none ever existed (Dachau), or else they saw their comrades depart for "gas chambers" which they knew of only by hearsay. This is generally true of most of these testimonies.

Until recently, there was Hoess' wretched successor as commandant of Auschwitz, Obersturmbannführer Richard Baer who took command in December 1943. Arrested in Hamburg in December 1960, he was incarcerated at Frankfurt and the preliminary investigation of his case was begun under the direction of Prosecutor-General Bauer. He was accused of having continued the work begun by Hoess at Auschwitz and, between December 1943 and October 1944, of having had asphyxiated a little more than a million Jews in the famous gas chambers, especially 437,000 Hungarian Jews. Announced three times at six monthly intervals, his trial was put aside three times. The last announcement made in April 1963 put the trial down for the spring of 1964 - 2,5 years after his imprisonment during which time the preliminary investigation was carried out. This was because he was stubborn and would not admit that during the time he was commandant of Auschwitz Jews had been asphyxiated in gas chambers. Furthermore he said that if such gas chambers had existed he would have known about it. Neither threats, nor persuasion, nor brain-washing - nothing could make him admit it. He had even succeeded in proving that what he said was true and had obliged Prosecutor-General Bauer to acquit him of that charge and to state publicly that it was incorrect to say that 437,000 Hungarian Jews had been gassed at Auschwitz. A defendant of Baer's stamp had never been seen before. A veritable catastrophe for the contentions of the Jewish Centre for Contemporary Documentation! Fortunately Providence came to the aid of Prosecutor-General Bauer. On June 23rd, 1963, the death of Richard Baer was announced, caused by a heart attack. So now he could be made to say anything that was required. Just as had happened with Gerstein.

I will certainly not go so far as to say that Baer was assassinated. No - he just died most opportunely, and it is only a matter of fortunate coincidence.

It will be a little more difficult to extract the truth about the gas chambers at Auschwitz. Sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof. So let us conclude by saying that if some day it were shown, in the middle of the 20th century, that an historical fact of such importance - involving

hangmen and victims together, millions of people, 6 million of them exterminated in gas chambers, or in some equally horrible way - could only be supported by such a small number of documents and, in addition, by witnesses of such doubtful character, one could claim without risk of the slightest error that it was not a question of a fact, but of an historical lie, the most tragic and macabre of all time.

Chapter VI

CONCLUSION ON NUREMBERG

The definition of the crime and the criminal, the point of departure and keystone of the Indictment, Article 6, was the master point in the Nuremberg Charter. In itself it involved the historian in the obligation to juxtapose all the parts of the definition with the facts on which they were lined up, in order to give as exactly as possible a picture, to place these facts both in their historical context and their judicial context. The master point of the Charter, it also became that of this study, which explains its preponderance here.

After investigation, the conclusion is that it is really not even a question of a definition, but at the most a *petitio principii*, a fallacy in which that which is to be proved is taken for granted, namely the sentencing of a single one of the criminals arbitrarily chosen from among all those who committed the crime. Since those who picked out this criminal and decided on his trial were those who, working with him, created in detail all the circumstances of the crime and his co-authors were therefore in league against him, it is clear that no other result could come from their cogitations. Since at the same time they set themselves up as his judges, condemnation became automatic, and the other Articles of the Charter add nothing but codification to this automation.

From these Articles, which amount to so many statements nullifying the customary principles and rules of Law, the most important have already been mentioned: the one which qualified the judges, who are at the same time party (Article 1), the one which decreed that they might not be challenged (Article 3); the one which called for expeditious hearing by imposing a rapid examination of questions raised by the charges, and of those only (Article 18); the one which freed the Tribunal from technical rules of evidence (Article 19); and the one which allowed them to accept as established fact what was common knowledge, without requiring proof (Article 21). We have seen how these last two Article, in particular, allowed the Tribunal to accept in the present affirmative tense, documents written in the hypothetical conditional mode (*cp.* Hossbach Doc.) - that there were gas chambers at Dachau, that 6,000,000 were exterminated and, in general, all that has been said on concentration camps by all the deportees, although today it has been shown that they expressed their reaction much more as victims eager for compensation and vengeance than as objective witnesses.

Article 20 could be mentioned too: "The Tribunal may require to be informed of the nature of any evidence before it is offered, so that it may rule upon the relevance thereof."

All tricky debate in public was to be avoided; thus the defendants found themselves deprived of the last guarantee of [122] International Law, which is the public nature of justice. After citing Article 8, no more can be said; the rest is a morass of legal technicalities of no importance. "The fact that the defendant acted pursuant to order of his government, or of a superior, shall not free him from responsibility, but may be considered in mitigation of punishment if the Tribunal determine that justice so requires."

So the Germans learned in 1945 that since the accession of Hitler to power, they had not only had the right but the duty to act as conscientious objectors, and were so informed by jurists (*sic*) who did not grant this right to their own nationals, and which not one of them has recognised in those terms since then. It is enough to make one tremble to think that if the F.L.N. had been victorious in Algeria and taken all French soldiers who fought against them prisoner, they could have sentenced them all by applying this Article 8. The inconsistency - not to say more - is seen at once when one knows that the masters of these jurists went so far as to cover with honours certain of their nationals whose participation, under order, in crimes maintained as such by the Tribunal, was indisputable. For example, Professor Balachowsky, Russian-born naturalised French in 1932, head of the laboratory of the Pasteur Institute in Paris, deported to Buchenwald on January 16th, 1944, assigned to Block 50, told of criminal experiments. Cross examined at Nuremberg as a witness on January 29th, 1946, after having admitted that "each one of these experiments amounted to an assassination" (Volume VI, p. 322), this Balachowsky justified himself by saying, "one had to carry out to the letter the orders given, or disappear" (*op. cit.* p. 328). Not only did the Tribunal not apply Article 8 of the Charter to him for having "obeyed criminal orders", but, as has been remarked, he now lives very comfortably in Paris, covered with honours, spreading trepidation and fear amongst those Germans whose orders he did not disobey. It depends on who you are. In that, the judgements of the Nuremberg court were indistinguishable from those of the court of the fabulist. And Balachowsky is not the only one of this kind!

All the attorneys at Nuremberg put in a plea to the effect that this could shake the very foundations of the state if it were universally accepted. Dr. Robert Servatius, Eichmann's counsel revived this plea in similar terms at the hearing of December 13th: 1961 of the Jerusalem Tribunal:

"Confidence in the rulers is a fundamental principle in all countries. Action is dumb, obedience blind. Such are the qualities on which a country leans. Are these qualities rewarded? That depends on political success. If the policy collapses, the victor will consider the order a crime. He who obeyed it will be out of luck, and will have to answer for his loyalty. The gallows or honours, that is the question. When it ends in failure, the order is an infamous crime, if it ends in success, it is hallowed." (*Le Monde*, [123] December 14th, 1961).

And in his *10 Years and 20 Days*, Admiral Doenitz makes the following commentary on this Article 8:

"...to ask of a soldier anything but obedience is to shake the very basis of the military life and compromise the security of one's country... Moreover, the nations took good care not to apply it during the Korean War as well as in the Suez expedition, in November 1956. On the contrary, the British soldier who refused to take part in that expedition was brought before a war council and convicted for refusal to obey, in violation of the Nuremberg Charter." (*op. cit.* p. 41, of the French ed.)

What troubles me is not that the foundations of the state can be shaken, but that an individual can be put in the position of having to ask himself, before obeying, not whether the order conforms to justice, but whether the one giving the order is the strongest of all those who, wherever in the world, have received from Heaven or from chance the mission to command.

Once more this is justice installed in the house of the Might that makes Right.

There have been many other violations of the Nuremberg Charter since 1945: the action of Great Britain in Egypt (1952-54); of Russia in Hungary (1956); France in Indo-China (1945-54), then in Algeria (1954 on); Belgium, the United States and the United Nations in the Congo (1958 on); without counting Mao Tse-Tung in China and Castro in Cuba. They are just so many crimes with regard to Article 8 and yet there has never been any question of assembling a Tribunal at Nuremberg to which to submit the cases of the guilty.

Only the proceedings remain.

To give an accurate picture would require a detailed examination into the manner in which they were conducted, running to as many volumes and pages as are in the Report - 23 volumes, averaging 600 pages each, in quite a respectable format, for the first trial, another 77 volumes for all 13 trials. In spite of the pleasure the polemicist in me would derive from it, that is a work outside the frame of this study, relating as it would more to the jurist than to the historian.

Besides, I think I have given enough specific examples to give a sufficient idea of the circumstances in which these articles I have cited were used to impose silence on the defence (on matters, for example, as important and as abundantly used by the Prosecution as the Versailles Treaty); or to have accepted as *bona fide* such obviously false witnesses as Dr. Blaha or the Hauptsturmführer Hoettl, and Wizliceny, documents as evidently distorted as the Hossbach report or as obviously false as the Gerstein report, statistics as fantastic as those drawn from Auschwitz commandant [124] Hoess' memoirs and disavowed by the author himself. In this first trial of the major criminals alone, one finds hundreds of examples of this kind, and their number or the lack of scruple of the judges were further multiplied in the dozen trials that came after.

To conclude, I would nonetheless like to point out two more of the eleven rules of procedure annexed to the Charter, to mitigate its imperfections with regard to the aim pursued: Rule No. 2 and Rule No. 4.

Under the title "Notice to Defendants, and Right to Assistance of Counsel," the first is, in paragraph (a), Each individual defendant in custody shall receive not less than 30 days before trial, a copy, translated into a language which he understands, (1) of the Indictment; (2) of the Charter; (3) of any other documents lodged with the Indictment; (4) of a statement of his right to the assistance of counsel as set forth in subparagraph (d) of this Rule, together with a list of counsel.

Nothing to show what paragraph (d) is about. On the other hand, paragraph (c) of Rule 4 exercises a considerable restriction on the provisions of Rule 2, concerning the right to receive all the documents referred to in the Indictment, by specifying that they will receive them "only so far as they may be made available by the Prosecutors."

From this we can see that the writers of the Charter took every precaution. It is fair to say that this last provision played a greater role with regard to "witnesses" than with "documents". The number of "witnesses" who had drafted "documents" either before dying, or still living, but whom the Prosecutor-General was not able "to make available" is incalculable. As if on purpose, the "documents" drawn up by these people were the most devastating.

But it is especially to Rule 2 that I would like to draw attention. First, the 30 days allowed for the delivery of documents to the accused was only rarely respected. Not one of the accused, in the Trial of the Major War Criminals at least, did not have to face, in at least one or two sessions, documents brutally produced about which he knew nothing. The President then extricated himself by stating that the Rule was not pertinent. The proceedings ended, one perceived that these little breaches did not prevent the judge from being very much to the point. And since the judgement of the Tribunal was without appeal, the defence did not even have the possibility of objecting on grounds of faulty drafting. This might not be so serious except for the fact that the decisions of this first Nuremberg Tribunal established the jurisprudence of the twelve that came after. Much more than by the facts brought out against them at Struthof, the doctors of this camp were declared guilty simply because they had already been declared guilty at Nuremberg, and in just about that way.

In the Struthof trial, Captain Henriot, government commissioner, publicly acknowledged that he could not prove that the typhus experiments of Dr. Haagen had produced death. But he added that [125] the Tribunal could base its conviction on presumptions of guilt and these presumptions of guilt, he said, had sufficed for the reasons adduced at the Nuremberg Trial. At the time (1954) I observed, in the Introduction to the second edition of *Mensonge d'Ulysse*: "This cannot fail to strike the reader if he knows that the Nuremberg Trial, too, based its

convictions only on testimonies of whose value we knew the worth; and on what is called the lies of Haagen, therefore on more presumptions, and consequently reasoned the same way. Thus the Nuremberg Trial inaugurated an era of condemnation, based not on facts judicially established, but on simple presumptions deduced from vague talk."

There is worse. However, to avoid being taxed with prejudice or exaggeration, I prefer to let someone speak here who is under no suspicion among the lovers of justice. This is what William L. Shirer says in the Preface to his *Rise and Fall of the Third Reich*:

"The swift collapse of the Third Reich... resulted in the surrender of documents etc., diaries, telephone talk, etc. e.g. Hitler's diary, a unique source of precise information, Goebbels' diary, OKW, Naval High Command etc. 60,000 files of the German Naval archives, which were captured at Schloss Tambach near Coburg, contain practically all the signals, ships' logs, diaries, memoranda, etc., of the German Navy. " (Am. ed. 1960, p. ix) 485 tons of papers... (This is a condensed translation.)

I ask the reader to think about these statistics. 60,000 files of the Naval Archives, records of the Foreign Office weighing 485 tons, hundreds and hundreds of thousands of documents in all. Who can believe that between August 8th, 1945 - the meeting of the Committee at London - and November 14th, 1945, the appointed prosecutors were able to examine this mountain of pieces of evidence seriously enough to make up an indictment historically and judicially grounded? Or that 30 days was enough time for the defendants and their counsel to extract everything from them that could be used in their defence?

Judicial truth, under the circumstances, of which historical truth is the only basis, includes all of that. And to seriously examine all of that would require, beyond any doubt, ten, perhaps hundreds of years, and thousands of historians.

For several years after the war, William L. Shirer tells us: "(these) tons of Nazi documents lay sealed in a large U.S. Army warehouse" and nobody showed any interest. In 1955 thanks to the initiative of AWA etc., papers were opened and a "pitifully small group of scholars" with inadequate staff sifted through and photocopied them before the "government which was in a great hurry in the matter, returned them to Germany." (Condensed from p. ix, Shirer, Am.ed., 1960.)

These "tons of paper" are now in Germany and it is solely up to the German government as to who should have access to them, no longer just "a pitifully small group of historians," privileged because they support the official view, but all qualified historians.

[126]

Permit me to recall that in 1960, in the course of a series of lectures in Germany and Austria, I asked the German historians to form an independent committee for such a study.

My appeal fell on deaf ears. The point I want to make is that one cannot but be dumbfounded that after just a few months of studying this immense pile of papers, a handful of prosecutors and judges together felt they could say that they were sufficiently enlightened - the former to draw up an indictment, and the latter to pronounce sentence.

Fifteen years later the blush of shame has still not crept up their faces.

I warn them, however, that even though he succeeded in having the Duke d'Enghien assassinated without ever blushing in shame for it, even Napoleon has not escaped the judgement of history.

* * *

Having chosen to expose the actual facts in terms of the appraisal given them by the Nuremberg judges, I had to depend on the classification which the Indictment made of them, and it is possible that at the same time the chronological order may have been a little upset and that some facts have escaped me - those which were not involved in a "decision in law," to use the language of jurists. I hope that I have not overlooked any considered to be important and that

any oversights have not seriously prejudiced the basic argument of this study, nor shaken the sequence of events too much.

If the medical experiments which played so great a role in the film of German horrors and atrocities, and which were carried on in a certain number of camps (probably Auschwitz, Dachau and Buchenwald), have not until now been considered, it is not an oversight, but simply that they have not figured naturally in the method I have adopted. I do not intend, moreover, to treat them in detail; a volume would be needed for that. Dr. François Bayle, doctor in the French Navy, devoted a masterly work of 1,519 pages to them, *Croix gammée contre Caducée* (1950) (without a bibliography because he did not have one, and also without an alphabetical index). Although this work is not without errors (far from it! - because Dr. François Bayle, being a doctor and not a historian, obviously did not tend to weigh the validity of the documents with which he worked but accepted them all), it is a mine of information. At least it has the merit of presenting, without comment, the documents he used. That the medical conclusions he arrived at from the documents are without value (because they rest on imaginary actions, that is to say, on nothing) is another story, and it is surely a sensation for medical science. However, it is not the business of the historian to do more than point out the verification or lack of it to those responsible for the teaching of medicine. Just the same one may regret that such a [127] work, of great interest to the medical profession, was undertaken by someone with no historical qualifications, when the conclusions he came to should have been based on historical facts. That is the problem with culture in general; a problem which will have to be stated again, from the start, when we study *The Destruction of the European Jews* by the political scientist Raul Hilberg, which presents the problem in about the same way.

With these reservations, *Croix gammée contre Caducée* is unquestionably a work of good faith. If the author happened to work on documents that should have been approached very cautiously, at least he did not invent any, nor did he twist the meaning. It must also be acknowledged that every time he had the chance, he never failed to put the event in question in its medical context and very objectively, too. Thus, reproaching the Germans for the medical experiments they indulged in - and this seems to me to be the normal reaction of a decent person - he did not neglect, like some Poliakov, Olga Wormer or other, judging from their writings on other matters in the same line, to compare them with the same sort of experiments indulged in by the French, British, Americans, Dutch, Japanese... Among the experimenters cited were: Strong, who vaccinated 900 persons in a British colony with live plague bacteria, without concern for the consequences; Blanc, who similarly vaccinated "hundreds of thousands of Moroccan natives with a live virus producing high fever, but who took the risk because of danger of typhus"; Balthasar, in American prisons (p. 1,240) etc.

It is no secret to anyone that before, as during and after, the Second World War, medical experiments of the same nature have been a regular practice in all latitudes. Nor that all the hospitals - and a few prisons, such as Sing Sing in America - always have plenty of guinea pigs for the doctors who do not give them much choice in the matter, especially when it is a matter of colonials or prison inmates.

The mistake of Hitlerian Germany was to carry out these medical experiments on subjects who were not their nationals. But when it came to a study of vaccines, other nations of the world performed experiments on a large scale on their colonials. In actual fact, we note again that Himmler prohibited them in all camps in a circular dated May 15th, 1944. Consequently, unless it would have been possible after that date to continue to send their results to the *Institut für Rassenbiologische und Anthropologische Forschungen*, which had made a point of broadcasting Himmler's prohibition, as the Hungarian communist Dr. Miklos Niyszli claims they did in his *Doctor at Auschwitz*, the "evidence" which the "historians" of the Jewish Centre for Contemporary Documentation present, after that date, can only be fairy tales; and that is what it is.

I would like to give another example of exaggeration in medical experiments: those of the Struthof (Alsace) concentration camp.

[128]

Until 1954 we were deafened by the cries of the press: "tens of thousands dead in the gas chambers of this camp." Even in 1963 it is not unusual to hear or read the same publicity refrain in the same words. In the first two weeks of January 1954, at Colmar, sentence was passed on Professors Haagen and Hirt, who were considered responsible for that dreadful crime. In the indictment, reproduced by the newspaper *Le Monde* (Paris, January 7th, 1954), we find:

1) That one of them is charged with the death, at his order, of the 87 Israelites, men and women, who came from Auschwitz, put to death in the gas chamber, later to be sent to Strasbourg to add to the anatomical collection of the German professor:

2) That it is said of the second: "I willingly admit that the first series of experiments did not result in death";

3) This commentary: "It is now a question of whether the typhus experiments resulted in deaths. Captain Henriët (he is the government commissioner who is prosecuting) admits that he cannot perhaps bring proof, but he thinks that the Tribunal can base its conviction on circumstantial evidence when it is adequate, as in this case. This presumption he finds in the testimonies, and in the reasons adduced by the Nuremberg Court, in the lies of Haagen (the doctor on trial) and his dissimulation during the first examinations. He thinks that these facts should allow the Tribunal to answer affirmatively the question, "Was Haagen guilty of poisoning?"

That these experiments mentioned in the charge should result in 87 deaths is of course horrible, both in principle and in fact. But, the "tens of thousands of dead" of the horror and atrocity propagandists amounted, after all, to only 87, and the gas chamber in question was not a gas chamber at all, but a hall for medical experiments which, although nonetheless to be condemned, is still something quite different. I immediately asked the question, "If you continue to claim that tens of thousands of deportees died in this camp, you must now tell us how they died, since it was not in the gas chamber." Since no one answered I gave the answer myself, which was within the frame of my general thesis on the phenomenon of concentration camps. All the camps had been "Rafts of Medusa"⁸ in which the *Häftlingsführung* (self government by the deportees themselves) selected - without any hesitation to be absolutely sure of not lacking provisions - not those to be eaten, but those to be thrown overboard.

I call attention again to the fact that in admitting that he could not prove that all the deaths attributed to the Struthof camp could be summarily attributed to Professor Haagen, Prosecutor Henriët asked the Tribunal to base its conviction not on the materiality of facts, but on "assumption." The Nuremberg Tribunal having already pronounced itself in this matter, it was enough to take up the adduced reasons, for the benefit of the *res judicata*. But the [129] Nuremberg Tribunal had reasoned in precisely the same way and, in order to condemn, had based its conviction on "assumption" (presumptive evidence) by referring to Article 19 of the Charter, concerning "common knowledge." All this was "common knowledge" because one could read it every day in every paper, so it was not necessary to go to the trouble to find witnesses to come before the bar and tell the Tribunal what they claimed to have seen, but what in reality they had only read in the papers.

That, for the time being at least, is all that I wish to say about the medical experiments.

Examples of this kind are legion, and I would need as many pages to refute them as Dr. Bayle needed to expose them.

If the need arises some day, there will always be time.

The Eichmann trial presented a delicate problem. From a work which appeared so soon after the judgement was rendered by the Jerusalem Tribunal, the reader surely expected that some special mention would be made of it. But "so soon after" is still "too little time" for the historian to present an objective picture. And I do not think that it is possible yet to add much to the references that I have made in this book.

Moreover, it does not seem to have enriched the file with many new items. Of the documents produced by the prosecution, every one had already been produced at one or other of

⁸. Refers to a painting by Géricault.

the 13 Nuremberg Trials. The witnesses who passed before the bar said nothing more than had already been said, and in the same words.

Many of them came only to recite not what they had seen, but, like all the witnesses for the prosecution at this sad time, what they had obviously read in one or another of the innumerable books published for 15 years on the matter. There were those who came to attest to the existence of gas chambers at Bergen-Belsen; there was the one who "saw" Eichmann listening with pleasure, on July 18th, 1942, to the report of the asphyxiations at Auschwitz, when at that date neither gas chamber nor crematory existed - as proved in official documents, none of the apparatus was even ordered from Topf and Sons of Erfurt until August 8th, 1942. Even the judgement could have been prepared a long time in -advance.

In short - the 14th Nuremberg Trial.

If it differed from the others it was only in this way: the conditions in which it could take place, the procedure of its development only added the abuses of Israeli law to the abuses of the Nuremberg Charter.

The following chapter will show most of what can now be said on that matter.

Chapter VII

THE EICHMANN TRIAL, OR ... THE NEW MASTER SINGERS OF NUREMBERG

On May 28th, 1960, the name of Adolf Eichmann, unknown until then except to a few specialists in the history of National Socialism and German concentration camps, suddenly became notorious in the world press. On that date Ben Gurion, President of the Council of State, ascended the plinth of the Knesset (Israeli Parliament) and announced to the deputies that "the person responsible for the death of six million Jews, and their executioner" had been captured by commandos of the Israeli secret service, and taken the preceding May 11th from Argentina; that he was in prison in Tel-Aviv; and that he would be judged by an Israeli tribunal.

And from that date on, the "six million Jews" - zealous journalists even spoke of 9 million - "men, women, old folk and children, exterminated in the gas chambers at Auschwitz" and other places, were once again served up every morning for breakfast the world over.

On the 11th of April, 1961, after a preliminary investigation that lasted no less than eleven months, the trial in question began at Jerusalem before an audience of journalists from every corner of the earth.

And on the 11th of December, the Tribunal rendered its judgement - the death penalty.

On Eichmann's personality, the conditions under which his trial developed, the arguments brought forward, the political context into which the facts invoked against him must be placed and the interpretations given them, the jurists, it seems, had much more to say than the historians, and for the following reasons.

1. Who is Adolf Eichmann?

Adolf Eichmann was born in March 19th, 1906, at Solingen (and not in Palestine in the German colony of Saron, as Mme Nina Gourfinkel succeeded in making everyone believe. She wrote the preface to the book of Joël Brand, *Un million de Juifs contre dix mille camions* (One million Jews for 10 thousand trucks) which holds an honourable position among the many historians born of Resistancism).

His father was Prokurist (legal representative) for the tram company of the city. In 1913 the family moved to Linz where, after having held the same job as at Solingen for a while, his father retired and opened up a business in electric appliances. But in 1913, the Eichmann family was made up of the father, the mother and only Adolf; of the five children it included (one of which was [131] from the father's earlier marriage), the eldest was German and the other four Austrian. In the 1930s, under Chancellor Dolfuss, this had a certain importance because the eldest, considered a foreigner in Austria, could not find employment. Through his family's contact with Kaltenbrunner, then leader of Austrian National Socialism at Linz, he became a salaried member of the Party at Passau, in Germany, because such activities were specifically forbidden to him in Austria. Thus began the career of Adolf Eichmann.

Little by little, he climbed the ladder in the S.S., up to *Obersturmbannführer* (Lieutenant-Colonel) of the *Reichssicherheitshauptamt* (Central Office of the Reich Security Service) in which, from its inauguration in 1936, he had been attached to Office (or service) IV B 4 (Jewish affairs).

In order to assess his responsibility in the Jewish drama we have to see him in his rank in that service, and we must mention that the *Reichssicherheitshauptamt* was composed of seven sections, all of an executive character: in the fourth of these offices, in section B (there were two sections - A and B), Eichmann was head of the fourth sub-office. Over him in the hierarchy, there was a colonel Müller, head of all the sub-offices grouped under IV B, about whom nobody has ever talked (he later became a very high police functionary in East Germany).

Above Müller there was another colonel - Roth - head of the two sections A and B. Above Roth was Heydrich, head of all seven offices. Finally came the supreme head, Heinrich Himmler. When Heydrich was killed by the Czech Resistance at the beginning of June 1942, Kaltenbrunner took his place and, until the end of the war, that was the only important change that took place in the directorship of the R.S.H.A.

In the *Reichssicherheitshauptamt*, Lieutenant-Colonel Adolf Eichmann was therefore sixth in rank, and on the functionary level only of decisions taken at a much higher level than Himmler himself, since it was only in 1943 that Himmler was raised to the rank of minister.

In the machinery of Nazi power there were thousands and thousands of posts with this type of responsibility.

From March 1942 on, the date when the massive deportation of the Jews began, Office IV B 4, of which Eichmann was the head, got orders to devote itself to their transportation to concentration camps. In a similar way, the office of which Pohl was the head had the order to devote itself to the economic organisation of those camps, and another office was ordered to make investigations among the Jews and re-group them. But since all the steps to be taken concerning the Jews were decided at government level, Eichmann's only part was to carry out the orders and only to the extent that the order concerned him.

It was only in relation to these considerations that Eichmann's responsibility and guilt could be defined and, in all traditional [132] societies, it is the personal drama of everyone to whom, under threat of severe condemnation, right of conscientious objection is denied. On this point the Jerusalem trial showed that from 1941 on, Eichmann experienced that drama in the same way that Professor Balachowsky of the Pasteur Institute at Paris did at Buchenwald - forced by Dr. Dingschüller to experiment on the deportees with vaccines, knowing perfectly well, as he has himself testified, that it amounted to assassination. I said in the same way because, if there is a difference, it is only one of motives. While the Lieutenant-Colonel, whose education was obviously rudimentary, explained his obedience to orders received in terms of obedience to State policy and love of country, the Professor, whose education could not be doubted, gave as his reason that he did not want "to disappear." That this difference materialised in the final analysis in the rope for one and honours for the other is the essence of the problem. If, as traditional ethics have it, it is true that in all this it was the motive that counted, one could then say that in this case the roles were badly allotted by justice.

2. The Trial itself

With regard to moral as well as international law, Adolf Eichmann found himself as a defendant before an Israeli tribunal under conditions which were as wrong to one as to the other. No one has more clearly established that than M. Raymond de Geouffre de la Pradelle in an article published in *Le Figaro* on June 9th, 1960.

It is best to let him speak for himself; if my competence in the matter could easily be questioned, it would be very difficult to dispute his.

This is what M. Raymond de Geouffre de la Pradelle says, all other considerations aside, on the question of guilt:

"The proceedings carried on right after the end of the war by the Allies were based on the London agreement of August 8th, 1945, and the Moscow declaration of October 30th, 1943, to which the London agreement expressly refers. The principle laid down is that of the return of war criminals to the country in which their crimes were committed. In addition to that, the London statute of August 8th, 1945, created an international military tribunal to try criminals whose crimes were without definite geographical localisation...

This London statute was promulgated by the Allies after they had received, May 8th, 1945, from the head of the Reich government, Grand Admiral Doenitz, through the unconditional surrender, the mandate of German sovereignty...

There is no international text given that gives the State of Israel the right to judge a foreign national to whom crimes against humanity are imputed, or war crimes, when these crimes were committed in a foreign country. Furthermore, at the time when [138] these crimes were committed, there could be no question of victims of Israelite nationality because the State of Israel did not exist.

The State of Israel is sovereign. Within the limits of its territory Israel may, if it wishes, by special law, give itself whatever jurisdictional right it chooses. But this right violates the general principles of law, and of the international rule of competence established for crimes having an essentially international character, since having been carried out in Germany at a time when German law considered them licit, they are crimes only with regard to international law."

And M. Raymond Geouffre de la Pradelle concludes that the only lawful procedure would have been a demand on Argentina for extradition by Germany, who alone was qualified to make such a demand.

It could not be better put. But Argentina had given Eichmann the right of asylum, probably the reason why, as any other country in similar circumstances would act, Germany did not demand his extradition. Is France today asking for the extradition from Spain of many French citizens considered by her to be criminals and to whom Spain has granted asylum? Even Napoleon III did not ask for the extradition of Victor Hugo from Britain.

Still, France did not go on to kidnapping in France or in Argentina. The only example historically comparable with Eichmann's kidnapping., is that of the Duke d'Enghien by Napoleon I, and neither Law nor History has forgiven him for it.

The reader will excuse me if, instead of invoking moral principles which are always debatable, I have preferred to cite the texts. Although they are colder, they lend the Eichmann trial the character of a Moscow trial; and if grounds for guilt could be stated against Eichmann, they have disappeared in the face of the unpardonable circumstances of his kidnapping and, in the eyes of posterity, the person who was condemned is more likely to be considered a victim than an executioner.

Posterity is all the more likely to come to this conclusion because Eichmann's defence was not able to cite in court all the witnesses for the defence that it would have liked to; for example, all the Germans living at liberty and in harmony with international law and the laws of their country, were threatened with arrest for suspicion of guilt of crimes leading to a death sentence, if they so much as set foot on the soil of Israel. Under such circumstances, Eichmann was not judged, he was assassinated.

3. The Accusation and its Political Meaning

The prosecution was considerably weakened by its central motif: the six million European Jews mass-extermiated in gas chambers. It can never be repeated often enough that this figure was given only by the press and the witnesses; as we know, the indictment drawn up by M. Gideon Haussner confined itself to [139] saying "millions", and that is the first step of admission in this obvious imposture.

After the war, in an atmosphere of mental confusion and general disorder, it was easy to have that argument accepted. Today many more documents have been made public which were not known during the Nuremberg trial, and these documents tend to prove that although Jewish nationals were odiously attacked and persecuted by the Hitlerian regime, it is not possible that there were 6 million victims.

Once it became possible to even discuss the figure and it was agreed by everyone in the world that the figure was considerably exaggerated, then it was possible to talk about how it was done.

For example, we know today that there were no gas chambers at Buchenwald, or at Bergen-Belsen, or Dachau, or Mauthausen.

Caught in the act of lying concerning gas chambers in these camps, witnesses who had pretended to have seen them functioning were naturally not believed when they talked about the gas chambers at Auschwitz, which is perfectly natural. Their credibility declined even further when they contradicted each other; if one could be believed, the other could not. Faced with these contradictions, what is public opinion to do except to dismiss both parties and to charge them with having fabricated the story?

If, on the other hand, from the number of prosecution witnesses still alive, one turns out occasionally to be of no more worth than those whom he is accusing - one of their accomplices or a former member of the Intelligence Service etc. - public opinion sees only added grounds for its disapproval.

Such was the case of von dem Bach-Zalewski, *Obergruppenführer General* of the Waffen S.S., and head of one of the famous *Einsatzgruppen* (something like commandos) in pursuit of partisans and Jews on the Eastern front. Thanks to him we learned about the activity of these marginal units, and of a speech given "at the beginning of 1941" at Weselberg (without any more detail), in which the Reichsführer S.S. was supposed to have said that "the aim of the campaign in the East is to reduce the Slav population by 30,000,000." But no one else has ever heard of this speech and no written text of it has ever been produced (Nuremberg hearing of January 1st, 1946, Volume IV, p. 500). On January 16th, 1961, this von dem Bach-Zalewski was arrested for "a political assassination committed in cold blood" on July 2nd, 1934, and for acts of cruelty in which he was involved "during the crushing of the Warsaw uprising of 1944 and during the struggle against partisans in the Russian campaign, as well as the execution of Polish hostages at Sosnovitz-Dendzin." (Newspapers, January 17th, 1961, dispatch of the A.F.P.) And on February 11th of the same year he was condemned to 4,5 years in prison, which shows that since Nuremberg justice has become singularly indulgent.

And that was the case again when, on January 25th, 1961, the British magazine *Weekend* came out with a photograph on its [140] cover of Hoettl, with the following caption:

The SPY STORY that's stranger than fiction
He was a friend of Nazi leaders
His real boss was a British secret service man

That was how it was learned that the principal witness for the establishment of six million as the number of Jews exterminated by Nazism was an agent of the *Intelligence Service* (!!).

It is well to make it clear that this figure of 6 million depends on two testimonies only: that of Hoettl and that of Wizliceny.

This is the statement of the first:

"In August 1944," said *Obersturmbannführer* Dr. Wilhelm Hoettl, head of the bureau connected with section IV of the Reich Central Security Office, "S.S. *Obersturmbannführer* Adolf Eichmann, whom I had known since 1938, had a conversation with me in my apartment in Budapest... He knew that he was considered a war criminal by the United Nations because he had the lives of thousands of Jews on his conscience. I asked him how many, and he answered that although the number was a great secret he would tell me because, from the information he had, he had arrived at this conclusion: in the various extermination camps about 4 million Jews had been gassed and 2 million killed in another way." (Taken from the Report on the Nuremberg Tribunal, Volume XXXIII, p. 85-87.)

And the second:

"He (Eichmann) said that he would jump into his grave laughing because the thought of having 5 million persons on his conscience would be a source of extraordinary satisfaction to him." (*op. cit.*)

Of these two testimonies, M. Poliakov himself says, "One could certainly raise the objection that a figure so imperfectly supported must be considered suspect." (*Revue d'Histoire de la seconde guerre mondiale*, October 1956).

Nobody made him say so! We also know that one of these two witnesses was an Intelligence Service agent. And the other, who had seen Himmler's signature on an extermination order, put himself at the disposition of the law in order to trap Eichmann and seek mercy for himself, but was hanged, despite his cooperation, for having been Eichmann's accomplice.

Concerning the political context in which the Trial should be placed, it is well to note that M. Raymond de Geouffre de la Pradelle was not the only one to protest against the kidnapping of Eichmann and to deny competence to the judges of Jerusalem. Even in Israeli circles there were eddies of feeling before the opening of the trial, and there still are, after the sentencing of the accused.

In the *Monde* of June 21st, 1960, one could, for example, find [141] the attitude of the American Council for Judaism,⁹ which represents the point of view of the majority of American Israelites, namely:

...The American Council for Judaism last Monday sent a letter to Mr. Christian Herter denying the right of the Israeli government to speak in the name of all Jews. "The Council declares that Judaism is a matter of religion and not of nationality, and asks Mr. Herter to oppose the pretention of the Israeli government to judge Eichmann in the name of Judaism."

To this, Mr. Nahum Goldmann, President of the World Congress of Jews, very embarrassed, replied:

"As the Israeli authorities have admitted, this action is obviously an infringement of Argentina laws. It could furthermore establish a dangerous precedent. But the case is so exceptional that the illegal aspect of the action should not be considered the only or even the principal element of the matter... The State of Israel cannot claim to represent world Judaism (Jewry), but since Israel does exist, and since it has succeeded in capturing Eichmann, I am in agreement that he be judged in the Hebrew State. If Mr. Ben Gurion wishes to turn the Eichmann trial into another Nuremberg it would be to his advantage to support the Israeli president with an *ad hoc* tribunal made up of representatives of all the countries who suffered under the yoke of the ex-S.S. colonel."

But even this point of view was not accepted by the Israeli government.

In any case, it was not a legal problem that the State of Israel was claiming to solve by this trial, but a political problem. Indeed, we know that the indemnity which Germany has been constrained to pay Israel, in the name of damages which this state did not suffer, was to come to an end on January 1st, 1962. Since the annual payment amounts to 200 million marks, one of the State's most important sources of revenue was in danger of drying up. It was all the more serious because the Israeli budget cannot do without assistance of this proportion. Israel has survived for twelve years, thanks only to the German reparations, American aid, French and British kindnesses and subsidies from Diaspora Jewry. Naturally, the Israeli government wanted to get a pure and simple renewal of payments for an indefinite period. No less naturally, Germany thought they had had quite enough. So it was not Eichmann himself committed for trial but Germany, threatened with having all the leading political figures of her government charged before the universal conscience during the course of this trial. All the ministers and the most influential members of Chancellor Adenauer's political circle were liable to be accused of Connivance with Nazism through this trial. And so it was really a question of blackmail: either

⁹ Editor's Note: Unfortunately Rassinier is wrong here. The American Council for Judaism is anti-Zionist but does not represent the majority of American Jews. He confuses A.C.J. with the more Establishment A.J.C. - American Jewish Committee.

Germany would accept the proposed [142] deal implicitly, or no German government was possible. Such calculations can, at least, be attributed to the leaders of the State of Israel. And, by a singular coincidence, it harmonised admirably with the concerns of the Kremlin.

I have found this contention in many publications which cannot be suspected of being sympathetic to Germany or hostile to the Jews. In particular, in the *Canard Enchaîné* of April 2nd, 1961, just after the opening of the Eichmann Trial, we read:

"The Eichmann Trial," said the *Canard Enchaîné*, "is going to appear as a trial of Hitlerian Germany on the one hand and of Konrad's Germany on the other. Certain people, such as some Israelis not to be named, say that they have no hand in it, and that as far as they are concerned they are interested only in a trial of National Socialism, do not care a damn for Eichmann and are going to multiply the proclamations against Adenauer because employed in his government are quite a number of ex-Nazis, such as his favourite, the Secretary of State Globke, dedicated annotator of the Nuremberg racial laws.

"During the hearings we can expect to hear the names of hundreds and hundreds of persons presently employed in Federal Germany. Such heaps of judges, officers, deputies, high officials, professors etc., are going to get so splattered that it will be a pleasure to watch.

"All to the good of Bonn propaganda. Some are laughing to split their sides saying that Nikita will at once certainly, and dryly, bring up the problem of Berlin, right during the trial, just at the moment when world opinion will be very aroused against Germany."

Two weeks earlier it had already stated:

"A few days after his capture (Eichmann), Ben Gurion, who was giving speeches in the United States, heard that a certain Konrad turned up in Washington again for a talk with Ike. B.G... took the first available taxi and hurried to where Konrad was staying.

"He went in with a certain smile, he came out with a grin. if you looked closely, seen in a fold of his tie (although he never wears one) was something like a cheque for 500 million marks. Germany was starting to pay again! At last!

"The Israelis are not in the least disconcerted when this detail is pointed out to them - after all, the expenses of the trial have to be paid for, they tell you, with a big laugh."

I do not know whether Adenauer gave out 500 million marks or not; the two suppositions are equally plausible. But if he did give 500 million marks, it was hardly more than two annual payments. In consideration for that sum, assurances must have been given to the Chancellor that certain things would not be said. And in fact they were not. The German press which reflects government opinion (*Die Welt*, *Frankfurter Allgemeine*, *Süddeutsche Zeitung*, etc.) was unanimous in underlining "the relief felt retrospectively [143] at the way the trial was developing." Before the first hearing, as *Le Monde* at Paris, December 16th, 1961, explained, Bonn expected to be in the limelight for weeks, even months, with a resultant stirring up in the world of anti-German resentment. Nothing like that happened. The Eichmann Trial did not turn into a trial of the Federal Republic.

The subsidies were to continue until April 1st, 1964. Between now and that date the Israelis will try to find a way to get a renewal. There are still quite a number of Eichmanns around. By that I mean persons who could be accused of crimes against humanity and against the Jewish race. Is Israel already nursing a plan for the kidnapping of the next one, for another blackmail attempt on the same terms? One hears a lot about S.S. *Obersturmbannführer* Dr. Mengele, doctor at Auschwitz, accused of the most unimaginable experiments on Jewish prisoners. In any case, it is a most profitable expedient and one that can be taken up again and again, almost indefinitely, and which could assure the financial stability of the State of Israel for a few centuries. When, at so distant a date in the future that it cannot be predicted, the last of the Nazis has been hanged in Israel, nothing will be left except to write the music for these *New Master Singers of Nuremberg*, since under the aegis of the Nuremberg trials the libretto has already been written for the new *Ballad of the Hanged*.

4. From Scandal to Scandal

The way in which Eichmann was kidnapped was a scandal with regard to the law of nations. We have seen that, in addition to the greatest international jurists, such eminent Jewish personages as Nahum Goldmann, for example, and even organisations like the American Council for Judaism were disturbed. In this line, there is more to come.

In Argentina Eichmann had made the acquaintance of a former S.S. man, Dutch by birth, Sassen by name. He had been a war correspondent attached to S.S. operational units during the entire conflict and been sentenced to death in his own country. He was then living in Buenos Aires on an import-export business, a little bit of journalism and other writings. For a very long time this Sassen did not know just who this man was who called himself a former S.S. man like himself; who frequented as assiduously as he did Argentine circles of exiled Germans; who said his name was Ricardo Klement, which everyone in those circles knew was an assumed name. But he had noticed that of all the exiled Germans with whom he had met, this Ricardo Klement was the best informed on what Jewish writings called the extermination of the European Jews, and he was not long in suspecting that here was surely a person who had played an important role in the affair. From then on he cultivated his friendship. At the time he had not yet set up the import-export business which is today his main [144] source of income. Promoting himself in his capacity as a former S.S. war correspondent in the theatre of operations, he had succeeded in making a connection with *Life magazine* through a relation. From time to time he was given a few lines of copy in *Life*, particularly on Argentine political matters, because he had been clever enough to make fairly close connections with Peron's entourage.

"Some day," Ricardo Klement often said, "I will write my memoirs."

But he had to earn a living and he had not yet got around to writing his memoirs.

"What a shame," Sassen said, "because you seem to be very well informed."

And thus he flattered him.

The talks took place in a little book store in Buenos Aires owned by a former German schoolmaster in Argentina. This man was not a former S.S. man nor a refugee. But he published a German paper with nationalist leanings called *Der Weg*, which all the German exiles read with great interest because, in their eyes, it was most objective and stated all the conclusions about the war at which they themselves had arrived. The talks usually ended in the nearest cafe with a drink for which Ricardo Klement had quite an inclination. To get at the secret of his personality, from which he expected to derive a journalistic benefit, Sassen exploited this liking as best he could. And one evening, having drunk a little more than he was accustomed to, as Sassen was going into raptures about the extraordinary exactness of his information, Ricardo Klement let drop the words, "Of course, I am Eichmann himself."

It was a windfall for Sassen. From then on he kept at him about writing his memoirs, but the other never had the time. Then he made the great play:

"I am going to help you. If you want to, instead of dragging these talks on forever in a public place, which will be lost for everyone, we will go somewhere else to drink and we will talk with a microphone. Then after each conversation I will write out what we have said. I will show it to you and you can make any corrections you think advisable. After that I will make a good copy.

"Yes," answered Eichmann, "but on one condition *sine qua non*. That is that everything which I have gone over and corrected shall not be published until after my death, and the royalties, less the sum for your trouble, are to go to my wife and children."

For greater security a contract on these lines was signed between the two men. Eichmann entrusted it to his best friend - that very bookshop keeper - whom he made his testamentary executor and the true owner of the copyright. He charged him with dividing up the royalties in conformity with the stipulations of the contract.

This took place at the end of 1955. The conversations before the [145] microphone lasted for about two years. Put down on paper, they amount to almost two thousand German size typewritten sheets. Before editing, Sassen gave them to Eichmann who covered them with numerous corrections. He wrote over the version that Sassen gave him as the definitive one and even thought that, having gone over it, it was full of imperfections. He considered that it still

contained errors, that he had to verify everything and that he needed lots of time because he had to think over events which he suddenly saw were much more indistinct in his memory than he had thought.

"Besides," he thought aloud, "from now until my death we have lots of time..."

So Sassen's work was put aside with Eichmann promising to get on with the verification and to incorporate the necessary corrections as his memory on the past became more exact.

Eichmann was mistaken. He had hardly taken this decision when he was arrested. Meanwhile, Sassen had twice gone to *Life* to offer sensational revelations on Eichmann's activities. Each time he was told that nothing sensational could be revealed on the subject for the simple reason that it was impossible to centre the attention of the public on a person who had been merely talked about during the Nuremberg Trial but about whom nothing had since been heard. He was surely, therefore, forgotten...

A great many stories were told about the way in which Eichmann had been found and arrested. The long hunt by Mosche Pearlmann gives the credit to Simon Wiesenthal, that incomparable gift to the Israeli Secret Service, with his talent for nosing things out. In my opinion things were really much simpler, but I will refrain from advancing any theory.

The fact remains that the incident which allowed *Life* to speak of Eichmann, with every chance of grabbing public attention, had happened; that it was able to print in 15,000 words what it described to its readers as a résumé of the essentials of the Sassen-Eichmann talks, the text of which was given to *Life* by Sassen; and that through Sassen a contract had been drawn up with the beneficiaries and that Sassen had been paid by *Life* for this work.

For anyone who would like to inspect it, I have a photocopy of the original of these conversations, gone over and corrected by Eichmann. To be sure, Eichmann was not a historian. His knowledge of the events he refers to was very limited, his memory faulty etc., and his talks contain many errors of fact, their dates etc. But I defy anyone at all to find therein justification for most of the monstrous things to be read in *Life* (November 28th and December 5th, 1960).

How does it happen that I am at one and the same time able to give such precise information and yet be in possession of a photocopy of the document which formed the basis of the *Life* articles, which I must here add was produced for the prosecution before the tribunal in judgement on Eichmann? It is very simple. The [146] Eichmann family, familiar with my works, thought that Dr. Servatius, defence counsel for Eichmann, might need a historian's advice and begged him to get in touch with me, just in case; and Dr. Servatius had already thought of that himself. All things considered, Dr. Servatius - on whom rested the responsibility for Eichmann's life and who had had the experience of Nuremberg - thought that a juridical rather than a historical plea was called for. That was one way of looking at it. But it was, above all, a matter of conscience in which I had no right to interfere. The one thing that strikes me as certain, after the event, is that no matter what plea the defence made - juridical or historical or both - Eichmann was in any case to be condemned to death. But who would have dared to burden his conscience with such an assumption before the event, even if he thought it, as I did? That was my case. I could see only one advantage to a historical plea and that was the impossibility of being able to terminate the trial without a delay of, I estimated, at least fifteen good years.

In short it was just circumstantial that I had occasion to meet Sassen, against whom I was unshakeably opposed - if only because the report of his talks with Eichmann was riddled with errors. I had several talks with him, some of which were very long. Anything that concerns him in what I say is but a translation of what he told me himself.

That is how the photocopy of the original of the conversations came into my hands, and I have been able to study them at leisure. In the same way I have had in my hands the originals of the minutes of the interrogations of Eichmann during the preparations of his trial, whilst he was a prisoner. I am therefore in a position to state that he contradicted what he stated before Sassen's microphone on an infinity of points.

Example: On April 18th, 1961, a witness came forward to the bar at the Jerusalem Tribunal to declare that he had seen "the factory (meaning gas chambers) working at full tilt in July 1942" and Eichmann visibly interested and very satisfied with a report of the results. Eichmann denied this but he had no evidence to support him. It would have sufficed him to say that in July 1942, in the official version, there was no gas chamber¹⁰ at Auschwitz since they were only ordered, as the official documents reveal, on August 8th and installed on February 20th of 1943. Perhaps Eichmann did not know this and, if once he had known, he had surely forgotten. It was probably the same with his counsel. So, the false witness was believed...

Examples of this kind are without number throughout this trial which lasted almost a year.

As for Sassen and the document which he turned over to *Life*, here is a letter written by Eichmann to his family on February 22nd, 1961, which tells what he thought about it and also about his whole experience:

[147]

Dear Robert!

First of all, I appreciate it very much that you managed to get a look at the case Dr. Servatius is preparing for me. I would also like to tell you about some of the fundamental principles which need to be raised, apart from some details which I will mention at the beginning. For I know that you, as my brothers and sisters, will be interested in this, especially as already whole libraries have been occupied with my career and, who knows, will continue to be occupied.

I begin with the current lawsuits which are being brought against me. The contents of these suits are so prodigious that even my anger would be useless. But I must on no account surrender in consideration of the numerous calumnies and defamations and give up the cause without a fight. It is obvious that 15 years of propaganda is against me, which grew like an avalanche and keeps growing and has been leading the minds here to allegations which are quite incomprehensible.

You will hear from Dr. Servatius that more than 1,400 documents are here under consideration (I examined nearly 300 of them during the investigation, the rest was transferred to my defence counsel after the investigation). Among the approximately 300 documents alone which were submitted to me appear approximately 240 different names.

Well, the investigation has caused the collapse of the great sensational build-up that certain groups of journalists had set up out of pure greed for profit; and I hope - naturally enough - that the coming trial will reduce my actual position back to the real level which I held at that time, i.e. recipient of orders; a bureaucratic occupation, not the slightest trace of killing and atrocity.

To be sure, all this has happened, one cannot deny it. But I was not in charge of such things and I kept my hands clean in this matter. This also includes the officers, non-commissioned officers and men, who were under my command at that time. Should the one or the other have overstepped their orders it was not with my authority in this respect.

Now to look at Sassen. He is either secretive or stupid. I do not know myself where I am. I am only asking myself, how can someone contrary to all arrangements commit such a breach of confidence and publish in rough the events which happened in the distant past and throw them to the international press as a kind of raw material which is undoubtedly full of mistakes and incorrectnesses that need to be put right and then say: "There you have the stuff, do with it whatever you like to do. How many dollars do I get?" Contrary to the arrangement which had been made he published the matter to the public without having given me the chance of correcting all the mistakes.

In this respect I have to praise the mode of procedure of the Israeli police; after the tape recording interrogation I had the possibility of hearing it all again and reading the transcript at the same time which had been made in the meantime and could make eventual corrections without being influenced by anyone. Although the transcripts had been made by honest police officers - and there were more than 3,500 typed pages altogether - there were even so quite a large number of hearing mistakes, which partly distorted the sense in the first transcription. Well, thanks to the procedure of the Israeli police all these mistakes could be eliminated by me. Sassen has given me no chance to do the same. I have no guarantee that the person who then copied it, heard and transcribed it correctly and I have no chance to control what certain interested parties might have added to it. At that time I got part of it for the first correction - and I corrected it superficially - but as the transcription was so deficient that there would have been no time left for other work besides the correction, I gave the whole stuff back to Sassen and told him that this matter

¹⁰. umigation Chambers.

had to be discussed more thoroughly because of the amount of mistakes. Some parts of the transcriptions were never submitted to me. What is more, this transcription having been controlled by me never should have been published; due to our arrangement and written contract it should [148] represent only the raw material which Sassen could use in order to make a book out of it which could be published. And even there I put in one more security codicil by ordering a written statement that no page of this eventual manuscript should come to be printed without my having sort of legalised and released every page by my full signature. And even after that I should have got the proofs as a last control whereby I agreed here to the fact that after the proofs had been finished no large changes in principle should be allowed.

But such procedures which Sassen has followed are unworthy of an honest journalist and I think this is typical of the fellow. How does this man dare to publish this article under the title: "Adolf Eichmann tells his own story - I conveyed them to the butcher - by Adolf Eichmann"? Sassen is lucky that I am in close confinement. It is a consolation for me to know that even a reader who is only partially attentive to the reading can draw conclusions from the title to the authenticity of the contents of the article. But unfortunately such an article will be read by dull-heads of all kinds, of whom one cannot expect objective, intelligent study.

Now I would like to ask a favour of you. You are a lawyer, I am sure you will discuss this matter with my defence; keep a close eye on Sassen and only with the consent of my defence should he be allowed to publish anything at all. For all he is going to publish forces him to fall back upon the treasure of the tape recordings of that time and there are solid arrangements which he has to observe.

Surely, there are legal restraints and possibilities? Besides this, I leave it completely to my defence to prepare the next steps which he considers necessary as far as my cause is concerned.

Dear Robert, I do not know what will come out of this trial; in respect to my person I must tell you that I am only of secondary importance. With the help of my defence I will naturally take pains to bring out the truth about the 15 years' calumnies and imputations, up to the very last days, which have prejudiced public opinion around the world against me to a degree which is not to be outdone. Here, too, I do not think of surrender. As far as only my own ego is concerned, the danger of resignation is great in respect to my almost overstrained fatalism. But I must not leave the matter as it is; not when I think about my children and you as my brothers and sisters and, last but not least, the memory of our dead father.

Dear brothers and sisters, I wish you each and all happy Easter, I wish you health and send you my kindest regards.

Your Adolf. I have asked lawyer Wechtenbruch to certify the correctness of this statement by signature, because I, separated by a glass wall, cannot sign it personally.

Given in a prison of the State of Israel on the 22nd February, 1961.

5. The Last Word

If the reader has been harbouring any doubt about the political significance of the trial, as described above, and the anti-Semitism it bred on the pretext of combatting it, it will suffice to say that many good people thought the same way. Over the French radio itself, the first press review of the reports of the first day of the trial gave the impression that in the minds of all the journalists there, without exception, the dominant idea was that the performance was not a matter of justice but of pure and simple vengeance, and that in any case, it was politically a mistake.

Eight days later, already sure of what to expect from the hearings, all the great newspapers of the world recalled the best [149] legal reporters they had sent to Jerusalem, in order to despatch them to more important trials.

On April 10th, under the title "This trial is a mistake," and over M. Alain Guinay's signature, *France-Soir* did not hesitate to say:

"There are a certain number of people who think that this whole trial has been a mistake. That far from eradicating anti-Semitism in the world it will only fan the flames, that far from instructing Israeli youth in the tragic fate of their elders, it will keep that aggressive youth from feeling any solidarity with those six millions who for the most part died without defending themselves.

"They are also afraid that it will have a detrimental effect on Israeli-British, perhaps even United States-Israeli relations, by revealing, as Ben Gurion has just done, that neither London nor Washington did a thing to save millions of people whom they could have saved."

We have seen how Ben Gurion failed in his attempt to involve Britain and the United States in his attempt to blackmail Germany.

With the trial over and Eichmann condemned, "the uneasiness" which everyone talked about remains. The anti-Semitic campaigns feared by France-Soir are taking steps and grow.

A boomerang? Perhaps.

Perhaps Tel-Aviv needs a little wave of anti-Semitism from time to time to realise its objectives, if only to bring to Israel those millions of Jews who persist in preferring the comforts of western life to the rigours of *kibbutzim*.

In any case, if the stirring of anti-Semitic feeling should trouble Israel and international Zionism, it is not the reasons adduced for the sentence that condemned Eichmann to death which will prevent them from assuming greater proportion, as they have been revived for us by M. Poliakov (*Le Procès de Jérusalem*, Paris, 1963) (*The Jerusalem Trial*). Assuredly not.

A strange fellow this M. Poliakov. An Israelite, born at St. Petersburg (Leningrad) in 1910, M. Léon Poliakov is directly descended from that generation of Russians chased from their homes by a Revolution which made Russia what we know it to be today and who, since 1920, have given Paris so many picturesque - and sometimes so encumbering - taxi drivers; people of all social levels. (But, to hear them talk, all of noble extraction!) Having arrived with the very first wave of refugees at the age of six, therefore too young to learn to drive, his parents sent him to a primary school in the 10th Arrondissement. He developed a taste for studies, went to the Lycée, then for several years to law school. His biographers tell us that this led him, not to the bar, as it does so many others, but... into journalism! And so one does not meet this 52-year-old man today at the wheel of a taxi in the streets of Paris, but at the Centre for Contemporary Jewish Documentation, with the title of historian. To him we owe already: *Le IIIe Reich et les Juifs, Histoire de l'antisémitisme* (The 150 Third Reich and the Jews, History of Anti-Semitism), and the celebrated *Bréviaire de la Haine* (Breviary of Hatred). This *Procès de Jérusalem* (Jerusalem Trial) is the fourth feather in his historian's cap.

He is very much at ease in this role, and Mr. Ben Gurion, President of the Council of State of Israel, has overlooked nothing in making his task easier. Indeed, we know that on December 21st, 1962, Mr. Ben Gurion decided that the memoirs (2,700 pages) which Eichmann wrote during his period of detention in Israel between the trial which condemned him to death and his execution, were to be turned over to the State Archives of Israel instead of being given to his widow which, if not the rule, is at least customary usage in all the courts of the free world. This decision ensures that for a long time to come all the Poliakovs of the world will be able to say whatever comes into their heads about the Eichmann affair, without risk of being contradicted by the contrary version of the historical facts of the matter. It also ensures that the judgement itself can never be questioned on grounds of any documents other than those very carefully selected ones used by the prosecution. The real historians who followed the trial will, of course, some day be given consideration, but thanks to this procedure, only by a posterity whose grasp of history becomes less firm as time goes on. Meanwhile, to public opinion, the judgement of the Jerusalem Tribunal has all the force of revealed truth.

And what truth!

M. Poliakov does not, in the first place, give us the whole text of the judgement. Of the 243 arguments in evidence which it contains, more than half do not figure in his book. He does not tell us why this is so, but one can be sure that they are the most questionable ones. As for those which he does give, one or two examples will be enough to give the reader an idea of their worth.

First example: the one based on the function of the *Einsatzgruppen* (units protecting the rear of the German armies as they advanced into Russia). These units were created, the Nuremberg court said, in the middle of May 1941 in anticipation of the Russian campaign. In the *Bréviaire de la Haine*, M. Poliakov proves to us with brilliance, with documents and testimonies to support him, that these units could only have been created at that date. Today, no less brilliantly and with no fewer documents and testimonies to support him, he proves to us

that they already existed on September 12th, 1939. M. Chaim Wieszmann, President of the Jewish Agency in 1939, who was then living in London and whose personal papers are collected at Rehovoth (Israel), decided it.¹¹ The Jerusalem Tribunal followed suit, and M. Poliakov too, of [151] course. If, some day, Israel decides that Einsatzgruppen were created by Ramses II and that Hitler only returned to a very old practice, M. Poliakov will be ready to prove that it could not be otherwise, with documents and testimonies to support him; that goes without saying. Since 1945, the industry of document and testimony production has been exceedingly prosperous, and Israel challenges Russia for first place in the world.

Is another example needed? Take the document called "Gerstein" which has been referred to. In the *Bréviaire de la Haine*, M. Poliakov gave us a version which he said was authentic and, moreover, he had corrected it. The Tribunal of Jerusalem brought forth yet another version which is different from the two already known. The latter was written in a kind of pidgin language and does not agree in any respect with the other two, doubtless so that it could not be said that it had been rejected at Nuremberg as had been the case with the first one. The reader is strongly urged to read the two principle versions of this document, in the last chapter of *The Drama of the European Jews*. There he will see of what prowess a Frenchman born in Russia is capable, who was driven to become a historian because he failed to become a taxi driver.

There is no end to the list of documents of this kind on which the Jerusalem Tribunal based its conviction, and M. Poliakov corrects his own contentions by first correcting the documents, whose origin is, furthermore, more than dubious. The court itself is not free from contradictions of this kind. Take exhibit No. 63, for example, which declares Eichmann guilty of having forced the German Jews to emigrate, and No. 155, of having prevented them from emigrating, in terms as scathing and disapproving in one as in the other. The cynical and cruel giants who, according to the philosophy professors of my generation, only gave one the choice between dying on the altar of Truth or the altar of Lies, with sincerity in the choice the only chance to escape the trial, were no more cynical and cruel than the Judges of Jerusalem.

We will have no more to say about this book and the judgement after this, which will be our conclusion:

1) Exhibit No. 79 says, among other things, "We will describe the activities against the Jews within the Reich and the European countries under German influence, exclusive of what took place in eastern Europe. In general, no extermination activity took place in those countries or in Germany..."

After the Declaration of August 19th, 1960, which was taken up in another connection by the *Institut für Zeitgeschichte* at [152] Munich, here is one that authenticates in a masterly manner the thesis which I have maintained for so long on gas chambers in German concentration camps. Carelessness, no doubt.

2) Exhibit No. 161, after stating that the number of victims cannot be designated except by the term "millions" which is that of the indictment, nevertheless declares that "it is beyond doubt that the number of victims was about 6 million."

By counting the Jews who died in 1941, in No. 122; in the camps set up in March 1942, in No. 141; who were taken to camps in convoys of 3,000, No. 112; when No. 127 says 2,000, and No. 154 only 1,000, etc. doubtless one could arrive at even more surprising results.

Eichmann's Last Speech

¹¹. In his memoirs, *Le Chef du contre-espionage nazi parle* (The head of Nazi counterespionage speaks), Paris, March 1957, Walter Schellenberg, who drafted the agreement between the O.K.W. and the S.D. on the subject of the creation of *Einsatzgruppen*, described in detail the scene when it was signed by Heydrich, head of the S.D., and the administering officer Wagner, who had been designated by the O.K.W. for this formality, with the date "end of April 1941," (pp. 229-230). But exhibit No. 69 of the Jerusalem trial makes mention of misdeeds of the *Einsatzgruppen* in Poland in 1939, supported by the report of a "conference of heads of bureaux and *Einsatzgruppen*" presided over by Heydrich on September 27th, 1939 (attached Document T. 164). It is true that argument No. 120 speaks of "massacres by *Einsatzgruppen*, created, it is said, on the eve of Hitler's offensive against Russia." And if I should ask who the rascal is that manufactured the false document, or the idiot who edited the sentence., what will be the answer?)

In matters of justice, it is a rule: the last word always belongs to the accused. Here then is what Eichmann, condemned to death by hanging, declared to the Judges of Jerusalem on December 13th, 1961:

"I have heard the severe sentence of the Court. My hope for justice has been disappointed. I cannot accept this decision.

I know that punishment is demanded for the crimes committed against the Jews. The declarations made by the witnesses here in this Court have astounded me, as I was similarly stupefied to see myself considered responsible for the atrocities.

I was unfortunate enough to have been mixed up in these horrors. But, these misdeeds were not of my own doing. It was not my desire to kill people. These mass murders are solely the consequence of the Führer's policy.

I tried to give up my job, to leave for the front so that I could fight honourably, but I was kept at obscure tasks.

Let me emphasise once again:

My fault lies in my obedience, my submission to my task and to the requirements of my war office to which I was committed under oath. Since the start of the war, the law of warfare alone prevailed. This submission was not easy, and anyone who has commanded and obeyed knows what can be required of a man.

I pursued the Jews with neither enthusiasm nor pleasure. The government did that. As for the prosecution, only a government could make that decision, never I.

I accuse those governing of having abused my obedience. At that time, obedience was required, just as it was later from the subalterns.

Obedience was elevated to a virtue. On this subject, may I ask you to consider that I obeyed and not whom I obeyed. I repeat: the authorities, of which I was not a part, gave the orders; they imposed atrocious tasks upon me which, on their orders, were to result in victims.

But now, the subalterns are also victims. I am one of these victims. This cannot be lost sight of. It is said that I could have refused to obey and that I should have done so. This is a consideration after the fact. Under the circumstances of the moment, this was impossible. It could not have been any different for anyone.

I know from experience that the legend must be kept alive, as it was done after the war, that it was possible to resist orders.

A few men were able to go into hiding, but I was not among those who thought that this was conceivable.

It is a grave mistake to think that I belonged to the fanatic persecutors of the Jews.

[153]

Since the end of the war, it has outraged me to note that all the responsibility of my superiors and of the others has fallen on my shoulders. I have to all appearances done nothing which would allow me to be accused of fanaticism, and the responsibility for this crime of blood does not fall to me. This is where the witnesses have gone against the truth. The declarations and documents presented to the Court as a whole at first sight seem convincing, but are untrue.

I shall try, in the next few minutes, to clarify these errors. No one came to me warning me of my behaviour. Not even the witness Probst Gruber could support the opposite. He visited me and wanted only to obtain certain alleviations, without criticising my professional activity itself. He confirmed here, in the Court, that I did not refuse him, but that I explained to him that I would have to have the opinion of my superiors since I could not make the decision myself.

On this matter, we have Ministry Director Loesener who reported on Jewish questions to the Ministry of the Interior (*Judenreferent*). He is dead. In a recently published memoir, he indicates that he was aware of the atrocities and that he informed his superiors of them. It must, therefore, be admitted that everyone at the Ministry of the Interior knew of these methods. But no one stood in opposition to my superiors. Ministry Director Loesener closeted himself in silent opposition and served his Führer as a wise Judge in the Reich's Legal Administration. Herein appears in its true light the civic courage of an important personality.

In a report written in 1950, Loesener gave an appreciation of myself by which I would have been one of the main perpetrators of Jewish persecution. But nothing is found in these violent sentiments which would support these suppositions, nor any basis for these allegations. This also holds true for the other witnesses.

The Judge asked me if I wished to plead guilty, as had Hoess, the Auschwitz commander and the Governor General of Poland, Frank. Both had the same reason for acting as they did: Frank, responsible for the orders he had given, was afraid of being accused by his subordinates, while Hoess was the one who had actually carried out the mass executions.

My position is different, I never had either the capability or the responsibility of someone who gave orders. I never had to deal with murder, as had Hoess. If I had received the order to perform these massacres, I would not have taken refuge behind false pretexts; I explained this during my interrogation: if I had found myself faced with an order which I could not carry out, I would have put a bullet through my head in order to resolve the conflict between my conscience and my duty.

The Court feels that my present attitude is dictated by the requirements of my case in this trial. There is a group of points which would seem to confirm this. The apparent contradictions result from the fact that I was not able to recall precisely all the details at the very beginning of the police interrogation. I lived through too many things that year.

I did not refuse to reply: the preliminary report of 3,500 pages shows this. It was my duty to assist in the explanation of the facts. Mistakes or errors occurred, but I have to rectify them. I cannot be reproached for such errors when a 16 to 20 year period is in question, and my spirit of cooperation must not be taken as trickery and lying.

My rule for living, which I was taught very early, was the will and ambition to attain an ethic of honour.

After a certain period, Reasons of State prevented me from following this path. I had to choose outside this ethic and commit myself to another of the multiple paths of morality. I had to bend myself to the requirements of the reversal of all values by virtue of Reasons of State.

I undertook my own self-criticism, I accused my conscience, an area which is only the province of my Inner Self. Considering myself legally not guilty, I neglected totally to take into account this point of view in this examination.

[154]

I would now like to ask the Jewish people for their forgiveness, to confess the shame which overcomes me at the idea of the injustices committed with regard to them and the deeds undertaken against them. Nevertheless the basis for this judgement appears to me false. I am not the barbarian I have been made to seem. I am the victim of an argumentation: I was seized in Buenos Aires, kept tied up on a bed for a full week, then given an injection in my arm, and taken to the Buenos Aires airport; from there I left Argentina by plane. It is completely obvious taking only this into account, that I was considered responsible for everything.

It all rests on the fact that a few socialist nations today, and others, spread calumnies about me. They wanted to place their guilt on me or humiliate me for reasons which escape me. A certain element of the press has been, regarding these incredible and false assertions, making suggestive propaganda for fifteen years.

This is the basis for this unjust condemnation.

This is the reason for my presence here.

I thank my defence lawyer who made himself responsible for my rights.

It is my deep conviction that I am paying for what others have done.

I must accept what fate has placed in store for me."

Obviously there is nothing remarkable about this statement of innocence and one risks little in saying that it probably will not go down in posterity.

Condemned to death in the last century by mistake, the innocent Lesurques declared: "I appeal to posterity." Not everyone can be Lesurques.

Furthermore, Eichmann was only a little Lieutenant-Colonel, of little culture, just like thousands of others, and perhaps tens of thousands in the German army, just as there are hundreds of thousands in the armies of the world.

I think it will cause one to smile today to learn that one man, responsible for all that can be charged to National Socialism in matters of crimes against humanity, was a simple Lieutenant-Colonel. Nevertheless it is so. In this direction, Mr. W. Kempner, former police commissioner for Prussia and American prosecutor at one of the Nuremberg trials, went so far as to call his book on the subject not *Hitler and Accomplices*, but *Eichmann and Accomplices*, which tends to show that it was not Eichmann who was an accomplice of Hitler, but the other way around!

What is tragic is that if one compares his explanation, or justification, of his attitude with that given by Prof. Balachowsky of the Pasteur Institute, a cultivated man (or at least he has no excuse for not being, covered with honours and all), one is obliged to agree that... it is not so bad after all. Between the Reasons of State to which the troubled conscience of the more or less untutored Lieutenant-Colonel referred itself, and the single anxiety to save his skin invoked by the Professor with the clear conscience, men of good sense - and even those who, like me, put Reason of Man before Reason of State - will not hesitate in their choice.

The reader will not be asked to compare this declaration, nor the charges formally made by the Israeli prosecutor, nor the legal and moral justifications of the decision rendered by the Tribunal; the contrast would be even more disheartening.

Chapter VIII

THE AUSCHWITZ TRIAL

On December 17th, 1960, in the region of Hamburg where he had lived under a false name for more than fifteen years, the German police arrested a man whom they quickly discovered was none other than Obersturmbannführer Richard Baer, who had been, from the 1st of December 1943 until the 25th of February 1945 - the date of his evacuation as the Russian troops approached - the second and last commandant of Auschwitz concentration camp. We know that from the 14th of June 1940, when it was opened, until the 1st of December 1943, the first commandant of that camp was Obersturmbannführer Rudolf Hoess,¹² universally known today through the subversive publicity campaign (as vast as it is unscrupulous) created around the publication of his memoirs in five languages, under the title *The Commandant of Auschwitz speaks* (published in French by Julliard, 1959).

From April to May 1946, Hoess docilely authenticated before the Nuremberg Tribunal (although with innumerable contradictions) some of the most improbable accusations brought against Germany concerning war crimes and crimes against humanity. Despite this, Rudolf Hoess was condemned to death on the 2nd of April 1947 by the High Polish Tribunal for having, the judgement states, "participated in the assassination by asphyxiation in gas chambers, incineration of living persons, shooting, fatal injections, medical experiments, starvation, etc. of 2,812,000 persons, most of them Jews."

"...the next day after, April 4th, he was hanged there at Auschwitz."

Then they examined his successor on whose conscience weighed the charge of having done his spell in that horrible extermination and who had brought the total number of victims to an indeterminate figure, but generally estimated in concentration camp literature to be about 4 million Jews. Having finally been found, he was at once put in the prison at Frankfurt and his preliminary investigation was begun.

This investigation was not easy: it seems that from the very first the ex-Obersturmbannführer declared that there had never been any gas chamber at Auschwitz while he was in command, that he had only heard mention of it - an echo of a rumour from the Nuremberg Trials, where he had hidden himself - and that he had gone into hiding not because he felt any guilt, but so as not [156] to fall into the hands of some misguided lover of justice. Fritz Bauer, the prosecuting attorney in charge of the investigation, brought up the statements of Rudolf Hoess at Nuremberg and in his memoirs; Baer replied that he did not know what had taken place during the command of Hoess, that he could only answer for what had happened

¹². Actually, there was an interval from December 1st, 1943 until May 1st, 1944, when Hoess' adjutant Liebaenschel was in command. The latter was hanged at Auschwitz at the same time as Hoess. (Rudolf Hoess is not to be confused with Rudolf Hess, still in Spandau prison.)

when he was in command, and he mentioned witnesses. One after another the prosecuting attorney had them charged with complicity and imprisoned. Today there are 23 of them who have been appearing over and over again, since December 20th, 1963, before the Court of Assizes (*Schwergericht*) at Frankfurt.

But right to the end Baer stuck to his position and they were never able to budge him from it. Nor have they ever succeeded in bringing the slightest proof against him. One serious problem followed. Was prosecuting attorney Bauer to be obliged to agree that the "434,351 Hungarian Jews, deported to Auschwitz in 147 trains, from the 16th of May to the 8th of July 1944" - as exhibit 112 of the Jerusalem trial attests - had not been exterminated by gas? He was not to be budged from his charge either. However, the trial, scheduled for the autumn of 1961, was first postponed to the spring of 1962, a second time to the autumn of 1962, a third time to the spring of 1963, and a fourth time to the spring of 1964. Suddenly, on June 17th 1963, prosecuting attorney Bauer announced that, although nothing could have led them to suspect it possible (a few days previously, Baer's wife, who had visited him in prison, had found him quite healthy and full of confidence that he would soon be released on "no grounds"), Baer had died of heart failure; less than a week later it was learned from the same source that the Auschwitz trial could be moved up from the spring of 1964 to the beginning of the winter of 1963.

So, since the 20th of December, 1963, this bewildering trial has been going on with no end in sight. With the principal accused person dead, the gain for the prosecution is that the 250 prosecution witnesses (escapees from Auschwitz and most of them former members of the 'self-government' of the camp) can come before the bar and say just about anything without fear of being shown up. What is curious is that during his imprisonment at Frankfurt from the 17th of December 1960 until the 17th of June 1963, Richard Baer was interrogated without interruption during the entire period, and yet not a word of what he said has been brought forth at the Frankfurt trial. Surely nothing could have been more natural on the part of the public prosecutor if he was anxious not to furnish the defence with arguments.

But on the part of the defence?

1. The situation of the Jews after the armistice of 1940

From 1933 to 1939, through diplomatic channels Germany had vainly tried to obtain from Britain permission for the transfer of [157] all the Jews in Germany to Palestine. But, on the claim which the international Zionist movement has been making since 1895, through the voice and pen of Theodor Herzl, which Hitler thought a little adjustment of the Balfour Declaration of November 2nd, 1917 could bring about, the British had always categorically refused. It was incompatible with her Middle-East policy, over which the Versailles Treaty had given her the upper hand; it was contrary to the national aspirations of the Arabs; then again, since the date of the birth of Israel as a State - May 16th, 1948 - there has been daily proof that it was not a reasonable proposition.

From the collapse of the French military force on July 10th, 1940, and the armistice, the leaders of the Third Reich nourished the hope of another solution to the Jewish problem. The government of Marshal Pétain reflected an opinion current in France since 1937, complaining that the under-population of Madagascar suffered to the point that its economic progress was irreparably threatened. Why should they not, then, allow all the Jews in the area occupied by German troops at that time to be transported there? So, from July 10th Germany sounded Vichy out about this.

The story of these probings is told in detail in a document dated September 24th, 1942, under the signature of the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs of the Third Reich, Martin Luther, which was produced at the Nuremberg Trial on the 2nd of April, 1946, number P.S. 3688. There we read that Pierre-Etienne Flandin, who had succeeded Pierre Laval to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs after December 13th, 1940, refused to hear anything about it. Knowing Hitler's views, Otto Abetz informed him of this immediately after the 13th, but Hitler was not disturbed; his plan was to get Marshal Pétain to get rid of Flandin, known for his

"Anglophilism," and Hitler had no doubt that he would succeed. He made no changes to his policy of the moment with regard to the European Jews because he expected the Vichy government, sooner or later, to put Madagascar at their disposal.

When Flandin did leave on the 10th of February, 1941, such soundings were resumed. The area occupied by German troops then included, besides Germany and Austria reconstituted into the Greater Reich (*Gross Deutschland*) the following:

- to the East, Bohemia-Moravia, set up as a Protectorate, by dismembering Czechoslovakia, from which Slovakia had been taken to form an independent state under German control, and a good half of Poland;
- to the West, Denmark, Holland, Belgium, Luxembourg and France, up to the demarcation line which cut her in two.

In all, how many Jews?

None, to speak of, in Bohemia-Moravia; they had almost all fled into Slovakia whence, not feeling safe because of being within reach of National Socialism, they fled gradually toward Palestine by the route of the Danube, via non-occupied Hungary, Rumania and Bulgaria, which were not hostile to them. This took place [158] slowly because there was the problem of currency, which in turn involved the problem of passports. In April 1939, Britain had decided to authorise free entry into Palestine only of those Jews who had £1,000 sterling (about 1,500,000 old francs) in their pockets, and to limit to 1,500 persons per year all those who did not possess such a sum. Further, Germany was quite willing to let go all the Jews in the area occupied by her or under her control, but was unalterably opposed to their taking with them the required £1,000. Given this, although it was easy for any Jew to get £1,000 (the Jewish communities were rich), it was much harder to get a passport. To achieve this it was necessary to get to Budapest where, as Joël Brand tells us in his book *One Million Jews for Ten Thousand Trucks*, the Committee for the Safety of Jews mass-produced passports and distributed them freely. If one was willing to arrive in Hungary naked as a worm, there was no problem; the Germans closed their eyes on the Polish and Slovak-Hungarian frontiers. But if one wanted to get there with £1,000 or the equivalent, which was legitimately and generally the case, the problem arose of having to cross the frontier secretly, which involved long preparations and slowed the migration down.

After surmounting this difficulty, another presented itself: on actually going into Palestine there was the problem of the false passport obtained in Budapest. If the British discovered the fraud the migrant was turned back even though in possession of the £1,000, and there was nothing left but to go the way of Central Asia, to reach Birobidjan, the autonomous Jewish state within the framework of the Soviet Union. The region of Auschwitz was under discussion at the Wannsee Conference, and Eichmann, when the Madagascar idea fell through, proposed to create a Jewish state there along the lines laid down by Herzl. With Himmler's assent, he began to gather together several tens of thousands of Jews, from the spring of 1941 on. This project, called 'nisko', was vehemently held against him in exhibit 72 at the Jerusalem trial.

Preliminary camps were set up, beginning with Auschwitz, and preparatory installations to receive millions... Crematory ovens were built, showers etc., which were called gas chambers. This is stretching things a bit far, especially in view of the admission by Kubovy (Director of the Centre for Contemporary Jewish Documentation at Tel Aviv) that no order for the extermination of the Jews was ever given by the authorities of the Third Reich.

2. The Number of Victims

A total, we "know, " of six million. At least the international Zionist press claims so, and the other press, in which the financiers of the Diaspora have sufficient power to determine its position to suit their theses, does not hinder them. Six million exterminated, in gas chambers, ill treatment, shot or beaten to death when captured by the *Einsatzgruppen*.

[159]

Referring to this point on November 21st, 1945 at Nuremberg, the American prosecutor Jackson was a little more modest: "Of the nine million Jews who were living in Nazi dominated Europe, it is estimated that 60% lost their lives: 5,700,000 Jews are missing from the countries in which they lived before and more than 4,500,000 cannot be accounted for either by the normal death rate, or the rate of immigration into 'other countries'."

How many at Auschwitz?

The most divergent figures - and the most fantastic, too - have been produced by the historians and statisticians of the World Centre for Contemporary Jewish Documentation: "Birkenau," writes one of them named Henri Michel coldly, "was the most international and the most western of the death factories, and its ground is enriched with the ashes of four million bodies."

Almost the sum total, then, of the number of European Jews accounted as missing at Nuremberg by Mr. Jackson!

But, in his memoirs, Hoess gives the following details on the total number of internees in that camp:

From Upper Silesia, or Polish Gov.	250,000
From Germany and Theresienstadt	100,000
From Holland	95,000
From Belgium	20,000
From France	110,000
From Greece	65,000
From Hungary	400,000
From Slovakia	90,000
Total	1,130,000

It is certainly obvious that if there was a total of only 1,130,000 Jews deported to Auschwitz, it was not possible for the Germans to have 'exterminated' more than that number. It is doubtless for this reason that, in a brochure published in 1961 in New York, the Institute of Jewish Affairs of the World Jewish Congress says that "900,000 Jews perished in this camp." (*Eichmann Confederates and the Third Hierarchy*, p. 13).

At the Frankfurt Trial on the 17th of February, 1964, Dr. Broszat, Director of the Institut für Zeitgeschichte at Munich, estimated the number of Jews dead at Auschwitz "at about one million." (*Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, 18th February, 1964)¹³.

But the press continues imperturbably to write "four million." (*Le Figaro littéraire*, April 4th, 1964 under the signature of M. Martin-Chauffier, member of the Institut, and *Le Figaro*, January 16th, 1965, under that of M. Remy Roure).

3. The Development of the Trial

As far as the Frankfurt Trial is concerned, after a year of proceedings during which almost all the witnesses for the [160] prosecution have come before the bar, things are just where they were when they started and truth has not made one step forward. There is no question here of reporting the trial session by session which would be impossible for me to do in any case. Indeed, it is known that in order to prevent me from getting at the sources directly, the German government gave me permission to be present at the hearings but forbade me to go into Germany! When I presented myself at the German frontier with all my papers in order, I was directly turned back to the French frontier. I was, therefore, only able to follow things from a

¹³. [Note de l'AAARGH: Rassnier commet ici une erreur de personne: la déposition en question a été faite par Krausnick et non par Broszat.

distance. However, thanks to an information service which I succeeded in organising and the important press service to which I subscribed, I had a fairly accurate picture of things. This is what I noted at the end of the fifth week of hearings, on the 16th of January 1964. On 16th of January 1965, that is, after a year of hearings, I have practically nothing to add or modify.

It can easily be seen, I said, that at the rate of two proceedings per week, at the most three, this trial will have a lot of trouble getting under way: at the beginning of the fifth week it certainly is not under way. From what little can be read about it in the papers, the special observers at it are in consternation: from the evening of the first day, it was obvious to them that they would be around for a while with the 250-odd witnesses for the prosecution which they were to hear. The 22 indicted men, on the other hand, posed another problem: on the eve of the first hearing, when they presented themselves to the secretary of the court to obtain the card entitling them to be present at the hearings, they were handed a resumé of the indictment which gave them goose flesh when they read it. Hundreds of children cold-bloodedly assassinated with phenol injections into the heart; girls thrown live into the crematory ovens; bullets in the back of the neck; the see-saw of death, etc. with a backdrop of gas chambers and millions of Jews killed. They were prepared for the sensational; I am sure that on reading all that, Madame Madeleine Jacob - called the Hyena of the Liberation - must have drooled. And then there they were the next day, confronted by 22 people with the comfortable look of ordinary middle class citizens, and they saw right away that it would take much more imagination than they had to be original and sensational in their articles.

This has been going on for a month now; at yesterday's hearing, the 'corner' - because it is a corner and not a bench - of the journalists was considerably thinned out, since many of them gave up trying to find anything interesting in this business. Let us render unto Caesar: after having listened to the interrogations of identity and main issues, among those who remain - a little more than half of the 120 anticipated by the court - who with few exceptions talk of asking their editors to recall them for other assignments, the dominant feeling is that now, twenty years after the war, the problem brought up by this trial should have been [161] settled long ago by amnesty.

And now for the facts:

Whatever there is that is sensational about the examinations of identity and main issues, it is not provided by the accused but by the President of the Tribunal who directs the hearings and the methods he uses, more than the charges he lists. The 200 children whom a single man (on Christmas Eve 1944) injected with phenol directly to the heart, the girl another threw alive into the crematory, shots from the revolver into the neck, one after the other, etc., it is clear that these are not the crux of the hearing. The main issue which will be the centre of interest is the gas chambers and the six million Jews allegedly killed in them.

This is the way the President stated the matter at the first meeting:

At Birkenau (one of the three camps of the great complex of Auschwitz, which also included Auschwitz 3 km. away and Monowitz 6 km away) there were gas chambers and, periodically, in the three camps of the complex, a selection was made of thousands of Jews to be sent there to be gassed. Toward the end, in 1944, selections were even made right on the platform where the trains carrying the deportees arrived. Did you order these selections, or participate in them, he asks of each one of the accused.

The question is subtle; he does not ask them if they sent these thousands of Jews to the gas chambers in question or if they participated in the exterminations, but only if they ordered or participated in the selections.

The inevitable answer is yes.

But in each case, as the interrogation continues, it is seen that not one of the accused knew that there were gas chambers at Birkenau. nor that the purpose of the selections was to send the Jews there. Now, among them there are two assistants to the two successive heads of the complex. There is even a Polish prisoner, Bednarec, who was a block chief and who participated with zeal, so they seem to divine. One wonders why all the prisoner block chiefs of the camp, who were all in his position - there are thousands all living and with a few exceptions all Jews - are not, like him, on the bench of the accused. The answer: this one is not a Jew. On

this bench, if he had not died during preliminary investigation, might have sat one of the two heads of the camp; at the hearing of January 11th it is learned that he, too, had stated that he had never known there were gas chambers at Birkenau. Strange, to say the least... And those selections? Their purpose seems to have been to separate those fit for work from those unable to work, the latter to be sent to special camps set up for them. This came out of the interrogation of Robert Mulka (today one of the big men in the export-import business in Hamburg) and of Hoecker, both of them assistants - one to the first commandant of the complex (Hoess, hanged at Auschwitz by the Poles on [162] April 4th, 1947) and the other of the second (Baer, died during investigation).

As to the psychology of the accused: they gradually decided that it would be to the interest to seek the court's indulgence and thus began to mention having 'heard' of unmentionable goings-on 'inside' camps; to interfere would maybe have cost them their lives, etc. The press could not have asked for better; more important than the accused, the big thing is to accuse the whole of Germany to justify astronomical indemnities... Once started on this track the accused are ready to state practically anything, fantastic figures of arrivals etc., that no one, not even the defence, picks up. But the press repeats these nonsensical figures. No individual is to blame, just all of Germany, the government, hence every person. Every journalist was sitting like the French Revolutionary knitters. The prosecutor tried to make Breidweiser confess he had participated in gassing, but at a date when the camp had not even been set up; he was so confused that he obviously knew nothing about anything.

On February 6th, this is what I noted in the hearings that had taken place since January 16th. Are we finally getting at the truth? The case of Breidweiser came up much sooner than anticipated. He had been in the S.S., the only one on whom rests the charge of having actually participated in gas extermination of 850 Soviet prisoners of war.

"Me, sure, I handled Zyklon B, but to disinfect clothing, not to asphyxiate people! "

And he proceeds to describe Zyklon B and how it works. Thus we learn that this famous gas, which until now has been described as "pellets from which gas was freed on contact with air" (this was said by some at Nuremberg), "on contact with steam" (said by others before the same Tribunal), was in reality in the form of a "liquid within a capsule," very volatile.

Since this testimony showed up the false testimony given by all the witnesses for the prosecution in all the trials of this kind which have taken place during the previous twenty years, President Hoffmaier shifted abruptly.

I looked back at my documentation and learn that Zyklon B was an insecticide used in the German army since 1924 and that during the Second World War, it had been used not only in the army, but in all the health programmes of the Third Reich and in all the concentration camps. On January 30th, 1946 at Nuremberg, evidence was admitted against the accused consisting of two invoices for this gas, dated 30th May 1944, one for Auschwitz and the other for Oranienburg. But at Oranienburg there were no gas chambers. (Report of Hearings, Volume 27, p. 740-42).

Question: What did they do with Zyklon B at Oranienburg since they did no asphyxiating there? It seem that one cannot find anywhere irrefutable proof that the government of the Third Reich never thought of using Zyklon B to exterminate the Jews.

[163]

Did they exterminate them in this manner at Auschwitz? First, this still has to be proved. And second, if it is proved, the problem of these exterminations will have to be looked at from quite another angle than it has been presented up to now - without the knowledge of the authorities of the Third Reich, as I have already pointed out. At the same time, the role played in these horrors by the 'self-government' of the camp will have to be brought up, if all the Breidweisers accused can prove that they were brought to trial for nothing.

Now we can understand why President Hoffmaier did not insist. Moreover this was the second time, the first having occurred during the questioning of the accused Hans Stark, the preceding Friday. The latter, in fact, did tell that he had executed five or six deportees with a bullet in the back of the head. "They arrived," he said, "at the camp under a sentence of death

given them by the regularly constituted courts of the Third Reich and I had been assigned to the squad." And that is how it is with all those assigned to firing squads.

Pushed further, the accused Hans Stark had also admitted "having thrown little pellets of Zyklon B into the crematory through holes made in the roof." The same operation described by Breidweiser, who had told us that Zyklon B came in the form of liquid within capsules. Breidweiser was supported by Dilewsky, who had watched from a distance, But, 'in little pellets,' says Stark.

The President could only become more and more embarrassed. But what embarrassed him most was Prosecutor Kugler, who sustained the accusation and who was the same age as the accused Hans Stark. In 1943 they were both 17 years old and both were members of the Nazi Party. One had been sent to the S.S. at Auschwitz (Hans Stark), the other (Kugler) to a regiment of Alpine Chasseurs in Italy. The first is today a university professor (agronomy) and indicted. The other a magistrate, and... judges, face to face, after having been so long side by side. The latter had the good luck not to have been assigned to a firing squad, at least as far as we know. The next day, he confided to the representative of *France-Soir*: "Happily I never had to take part in one of those operations! " Indeed ...

And happily, too, for Mr. Eugen Gerstenmaier (today President of the Bundestag) and Heinrich Luebke (today President of the Federal Republic), who were also important persons under Hitler and warmly approved his policies. The first was a member of the Nazi Party (on mission in a university during the war). As for the second, his case was much more serious: head of an industrial outfit working on the manufacture of the V1 and V2, using manpower detailed from the half starved deportees of the Peenemunde concentration camp (Baltic). And he has never appeared among the accused at any trial of the Frankfurt kind for participation in the horrors of the Peenemunde concentration camp!

[164]

February 20th:

It is over; all the accused have been interrogated, the first phase of the trial is over. The Tribunal relaxed and did not resume until last Monday, the 17th of February, for the good reason that at Frankfurt, as at Nice, the Carnival is sacred.

At the moment - and this will go on until February 24th - specialists are being heard from the Institute of Contemporary History at Munich, that world paragon of anti-Nazi resistance. They have been brought here as experts to authenticate the written testimonies whose authors are dead or are unable to appear for public reading. It is not without interest to note that these are the very same experts whom I forced to admit on August 19th, 1960 that there had "never been any gas chamber in any concentration camp in the territory of the Grand Reich." And they had, until then, maintained the opposite.

February 17th, the first witness was heard - and the most important witness for the prosecution: Mr. Hermann Langbein, Austrian Israelite, Secretary General of the International Committee of the Survivors of Auschwitz. The *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung* on the 27th of January had published with a trumpet blast an article about him that was, in my view, the sensation of the week.

First by its title: "Capacity of the crematory ovens at Auschwitz - 4756 bodies a day." Precise. But, in 1951, this capacity was set at 20,000 bodies per day, on oath before the courts at that time of a dead Hungarian doctor named Miklos Nyiszli, whose detailed testimony was published in France by *Les Temps Modernes* (March and April, 1951).

But this article was even more surprising. It said that Mr. Hermann Langbein had been interned for two years at Auschwitz, where he carried on the duties of secretary to S.S. Dr. Wirths, the one directly in charge of gas extermination, and that in that camp there was such an insufficiency of food (1,800 calories a day provided for by the R.S.H.A.) that one could not survive for more than four months unless one 'organised' - in the lingo of the camps 'organise' meant to steal right and left, bread here, margarine there, soup somewhere else, etc.

But Mr. Hermann Langbein survived for two years. Conclusion: he 'organised' food - food taken from the rations of the other prisoners. Not surprising: to be secretary to Dr. Wirths meant that he was part of the 'self-government' of the camp, that group of prisoners who assumed administration and policing - and whose' main occupation consisted in helping itself first to the 1,800 calorie rations which arrived every day at the camp, to get 3,000 to 4,000 for themselves, thus condemning the mass of prisoners to exist on 600, 800 or 1,000 calories; in other words, to die of hunger little by little.

I am not the one who is saying all this, it is Mr. Langbein who admits it himself; if he survived for two years in a camp where [165] one could not live more than four months on the allocated rations, except by stealing food from one's companions in prison, the obvious conclusion is that he was himself among the thieves, that he caused a certain number of his co-prisoners to die of hunger, that he contributed to the horror of the camp and therefore his place was in the dock with the accused, not with the prosecutors.

If one looks at the descriptive list of the 250 witnesses for the prosecution who filed through the court day after day, it is seen that they are all like Mr. Hermann Langbein, and that in that camp where one could not survive more than four months without "stealing" from the rations of one's co-prisoners, they all survived from two to four -years...

To give some idea of the significance of this thievery we must look at the testimony of Dr. Hans Winch, S.S. doctor of Auschwitz. He came after Langbein to affirm that 25% of the camp prisoners (the cadres, he said explicitly) were sufficiently nourished, and that 75% never had enough to eat, so little in fact that at the end of four months they were dying of hunger. And Dr. Hans Winch gave figures: in order to live normally at Auschwitz a prisoner needed, he said, 5,000 calories. So, if 25% got these 5,000 calories for themselves (and they were able to since they administered the camp and distributed the food), that is, three rations apiece, or just about, then the other 75% got about a third of an 1,800 calorie ration, or about 600 calories. The mass of prisoners were in reality condemned to death by the 'self-government.' I am very much afraid that here lie the real figures of the famous 'gas chambers'!

Two of the accused out of 23 partially confessed to what they were accused of, and I must admit that this is remarkable. In 1946, at Nuremberg, they would all have admitted everything. This is proof that we are no longer in 1946... So we must have a look at what these two admitted. It is clear about the first - the accused Hans Stark, today professor of agronomy - who had been assigned to a firing squad to take care of persons condemned to death in the regular courts of the Third Reich. No need to come back to that.

As for the second, non-commissioned officer Klaehr, he admitted that he had killed 200 to 300 Jewish prisoners with injections of phenol. I advise the reader to read carefully a remarkable book by Maurice Garçon *La vie exécrable de Guillemette Babin*. In the Middle Ages, accused of sorcery, she admitted having met every night at midnight, in orgiastic witches' revels, incubuses and succubuses, on the promise that if she confessed she would not be burned as a sorcerer. Klaehr was accused of having killed these 200 to 300 Jews by injection into the heart on Christmas Eve of 1942. He denied having done it that night. During the trial two things came out: on Christmas Eve 1942 he was not even at Auschwitz; on the other hand, for one [166] man to inject 200 to 300 people in one evening was a little too much. Ask the first medical student you come across. So he admitted having reached this figure in two months, at the rate of ten or fifteen at a time. This is much more plausible. But is it any nearer the truth? That is another question.

What is curious is that during two months of hearings, the problem of gas chambers per se has not been brought up. Every time the occasion arises, President Hoffmaier (former S.S. Nazi in Italy) limits the answers of the accused to the problem of 'selections' within the camp or on the arrival platform.

Each time the scenario is the same; I never knew there were gas chambers at Auschwitz, says the accused. And the President says, all the same, men were selected out, therefore . . . The accused remains silent, since it is true that selections were made and he can only assent.

It seems that these operations should be explained. The purpose we know; to separate out the sick, unable to work, from the capable. What happened to the former? The witnesses for the

prosecution we have been hearing since February 27th invariably answer that they were sent to the gas chambers. What is curious is that they have all seen them, loaded into trucks or railcars, leave the camp, but no one has seen them arrive at the gas chamber in question, nor has anyone been present at an extermination.

On the other hand, it suffices to read *The Tragedy of the Deportation* (*La Tragédie de la déportation*) (published under the direction of Olga Wormser and Henri Michel, Hachette, 1962) to see that a great number of the authors of concentration camp literature have seen convoys of the sick coming from Auschwitz and arriving at Bergen-Belsen, Neuengamme, Buchenwald, Dora, Ravensbrück, Flossenbürg, etc. during the year 1943, and especially after May 1944. From Auschwitz but not only from Auschwitz: from all the concentration camps which were, in the view of the Third Reich, work camps and not extermination camps.

Explanation: a work camp, or concentration camp, which let out deportees to industrial works in the region where they were, was to be profitable. And the S.S. guard at the entrance looked to it to see that in each of them, the number of the sick who were incapable of working (the 'useless mouths' as Mme. de Beauvoir said) should not threaten this return. Every time they thought this number excessive, they had the 'self-government' of the camp, within the camp (Kapo, Vorarbeiter, bludgeon in hand) carry out regular raids, which were regular man hunts - every sick man tried to escape this because he was certain that he was going to be sent to the gas chambers.

Those who were 'selected' were sent to one or another of the above-cited camps, most often to Bergen-Belsen and Neuengamme, specially set up for the sick from all the camps. Since their companions in misfortune did not see them again they came to the conclusion that they had been sent to the gas chambers. In [167] the camp lingo the whole operation was delineated in the expression *Himmelsfahrtkommando*, kommando for departure to Heaven.

In reality not a single new item has appeared since 20th of February when the last testimony was given. Things are just as they were. We have heard witnesses caught in flagrant lies, others who have retracted what they have said, others who have told as something "seen" only what they have simply read. There was even a trip to Auschwitz - nothing came from that.

From the point of view of history this trial is bound to be a total failure and one little thing will prove it. In 1945, writing his *SS-Staat*, Eugen Kogon had found only one witness to attest to the extermination of the Jews by gas. This was a certain Janda Weiss, who lived at Brno (on the other side of the Iron Curtain) whom nobody could cross-question. Today, Prosecutor Fritz Bauer has succeeded in producing 250 before the Frankfurt Tribunal! As time goes on and as long as trials of this type are held, the number of witnesses of this kind will only grow and grow, and more and more will come from behind the Iron Curtain. Already, the majority of those at Frankfurt have come from there; they are all either communists, Jews or both.

For the next five years 500 trials are expected or are in preparation. About 15,000 persons are under lock and key and they may well be joined by many others. That is to say, they haven't finished showing us again and again that Germany is a country of barbarians, unworthy of being integrated into the community of the European people, to the great pleasure of the masters of the Kremlin and the international Zionist movement, associated in this joint enterprise for the destruction of Europe - and that is the whole problem.

Because, and I repeat, either a Europe will be created in which Germany will have her place with equal rights with the other European peoples, in which case Bolshevism will begin to recede, or Germany will be refused integration into the community of European peoples and there will never be a Europe.

To this political argument an economic one can be added: Germany, declared to be solely responsible for the Second World War, must alone pay reparations and, first of all, the wrongs the State of Israel claims to have suffered. But at 5,000 DM per victim, six million victims makes quite a stir, just for physical damages alone. And that is quite apart from what the Claims Conference which met at Brussels, 9th to 13th March 1964, decided was due to be paid to the surviving Jews as an indemnity for "material goods stolen by the Germans." And these, according to *La Terre Retrouvée* of April 14th, 1964, come to:

[168]

Germany	2 billion dollars
Poland	3 billion dollars
Rumania	1 billion dollars
Hungary	570 million dollars
France	950 million dollars
Czechoslovakia	650 million dollars
Belgium	618 million dollars
Holland	450 million dollars
Slovakia	140 million dollars
Greece	120 million dollars
	9,490 million dollars

And, in addition, the war debts which will be claimed from Germany by the Allies who conquered her, the sum of which will be fixed, according to resolutions taken at London on February 27th, 1953, on the signing of the Peace Treaty with 're-united Germany.' Yugoslavia has already stated a claim for 70 billion dollars, Greece for 20 billion... The others have said nothing specific yet, but nothing is lost in the waiting.

To exact from Germany such fantastic sums, which in all exceed by far the total of what was exacted at Versailles in 1919, is as much as to say that she shall revert to another Weimar Republic - or something still worse! It is another way of destroying Europe, or - to deliver her to Bolshevism.

It is, of course, not easy to get anyone to admit that such a plan exists, neither the Germans nor any other peoples. Hence these trials which are but the spring-board for that propaganda.

The vexing thing about these trials is that they are going around in circles - the more witnesses are found, the less reliable they are. So they are constantly referring back to the first testimony concerning Auschwitz, that of Rudolf Hoess. Every time the defence puts a witness on the spot, President Hoffmaier throws in his face *The Commandant of Auschwitz Speaks*.

After that everything goes on as if the defence were ignorant of the fact that Rudolf Hoess had also testified at Nuremberg on April 26th, 1946, and that after having claimed at Nuremberg (*Report of the Trial*, Volume XI, pp. 410 ff.) that about three million Jews had been exterminated (2,500,000 of them by gas), he wrote in the book in question (p. 239) that, at the very most, 1,130,000 persons had been interned in that camp. Or as if the defence were also ignorant of the fact that that is not the only contradiction which a comparison of the two successive testimonies by the same man reveals: like convoys of Jews 'never made up of. more than 1,000 persons' (p. 229), but which, at the rate of 'five convoys a day' (p. 236) 'brought 15,000 persons to the camp every day'(p. 239); the gas chambers which Himmler gave him the order to build to physically exterminate the Jews (p. 227), but on which subject 'we were never able to get a clear and precise decision from Himmler' (p. 233); Zyklon B, which is sometimes a liquid, sometimes tablets releasing gas on contact with air; the operation of extermination itself, which 'lasts on an average of [169] half an hour' (p. 174) after which the doors are opened and 'the sonderkommando begins at once its work of clearing away the bodies' (p. 230) but the handling of Zyklon B is so dangerous that the gas chamber 'has to be aired for two days before one can go in' (p. 229). etc.

In a word, an apocryphal document: Hoess was hanged at Auschwitz on the 4th of April 1947 and he certainly will not return to protest against what he is being made to say today. Moreover, Dr. Broszat, director of the Institute of Contemporary History at Munich, stated to the court at Frankfurt last February 26th (1964), that "one could not rely on the statements of Rudolf Hoess." (*Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, February 27th, 1964).

So?

So, the accused at the Frankfurt Trial will be condemned as well as those at the 500 other trials; there will have been no proof, but...

But Germany will pay and that is what is essential.

What matter the means? And what matter Europe!

Israel first, and even at the price of the dissolution of Europe - or of its bolshevisation (read: slavisation), since bolshevism is only the modern form of pan-slavism, which amounts to the same thing.

End of the book



Marshal Rydz-Smigly, a Polish Idi Amin who bragged: “Poland wants war with Germany and Germany will not be able to avoid it even if she wants to” (*Daily Mail*, August 6th, 1939).

The Tunnel at Dora

Paul Rassinier

The date was March 31, 1944. For the past week the Kapos, the Lagerschutz, and the Block Chiefs had been particularly on edge. Quite a number of prisoners had died from blows; lice were found not only in the Tunnel, but even among the Kommandos outside; and the S.S.-Führung laid the responsibility for this state of affairs on the H-Führung. On top of that, the weather the whole day long was terrible: it was colder than usual, and an icy rain mixed with hail came down without any let-up. In the evening, we got to the muster grounds, frozen, soaked, and hungry beyond belief. How we hoped the roll would not last too long! But, there was no such luck. At ten o'clock we were still standing at attention under the rain of hail, waiting for the order *Abtreten!* (break ranks!) which would liberate us. Finally it came, and we could go and eat the hot soup in a hurry and fall onto the straw. We got to the Block and began the shoe-cleaning. But, then, gesturing that we should stay outside, the Block Chief, standing framed in the entrance, announced that since lice had been found, the whole camp was going to be disinfected.

It was to begin that night. Five of the 35 Blocks were picked for *Entläusung* (delousing) that night. Consequently, that night there was no soup until that was over. The delousing process then began: “*Alles da drin!*” (Everybody in there!). We went into the Esszimmer with our shoes in our hands. “*Ausziehen!*” (Undress!). We took our clothes off, wrapped them in a bundle with the number on top. “*Zu fünf!*” (By fives!). That frightened us. “*Zu fünf!*” We form into lines. With the Stubendienst carrying our clothes on blankets, surrounding us, all naked, in the cold, in the rain and the snow, we went in the direction of the building where we were to be deloused. There were about 800 yards to cross.

When we got there, the four other Blocks, naked like us, were already pushing against the entrance. We felt Death in our presence. How long would it last? There were about a thousand of us, all naked and shaking in the wet and the cold which penetrated to our very bones, pushing at the doors. There was no way to get in. Only forty at a time could go in. The scene was hideous. At first we tried to force our way in, but the delousing men kept us back with water hoses. Then we wanted to go back to the Block to wait our turns; but that was impossible since the Lagerschutz, truncheons in hand, surrounded us. So we had to stay there, crowded together, between the water and the truncheons, soaked and beaten. We pressed together. Every ten minutes, forty of us were allowed to enter the delousing chamber in a crush that was a life and death struggle. Elbows went into play; there were fights, and the weaker were mercilessly trampled underfoot, and their bodies were found at dawn. At about two in the morning, I succeeded in getting inside, Fernand behind me, where we received a haircut, cressyl, and shower. At the exit we were given a shirt and a pair of shorts which we wore when we went out into the night to return to the Block. I felt as though I had accomplished some act of heroism. When we came to the Block, we went into the Esszimmer where a Stubendienst handed us our clothes which had been disinfected. Next came soup and bed.

At reveille, the sinister comedy was just barely finishing. At least half of the Block got back only just in time to get dressed, get soup, get the daily ration, and hurry to the grounds to go to work. And, there were a number missing: those who had died during the execution of this sorry business. Others survived it only for a few hours or for two or three days and were carried away with the inevitable double pneumonia. The job itself probably killed as many men as it did lice.

How did it happen? The S.S.-Führung was responsible only for the decision to disinfect five Blocks per day, and the H-Führung was left in complete control of how it was to be carried out. A schedule could have been set up: at eleven, Block 35, at midnight, 24, at one, number 32, etc... The Block Chiefs could have, within this framework, sent us in groups of one hundred at twenty-minute intervals, for example, and in our clothes. But no, that would have been too simple.

When what took place on the night of March 31st reached the ears of the S.S.-Führung, the latter itself set up an exact schedule the next morning for the Blocks that remained to be disinfected.

April 2, 1944: Easter. The S.S.-Führung decided on a twenty-four hour rest period which was not to be disturbed except by a general roll-call, that is, the Tunnel people as well as the quarry workers would be present. The weather was magnificent, a radiant sun in a pure calm sky. Joy;

the Gods were with us! We got up at six instead of four-thirty: washing and food distribution was done at a slower pace.

Nine o'clock. All the Kommandos were on the grounds at attention. The Lagerschutz went in and out among the groups; Block Chiefs were at their stations. The Lagerältester chatted familiarly with the Rapportführer. He had a paper in his hand: a detailed list of the camp personnel drawn up by the Arbeitsstatistik. About thirty S.S. in helmets, their pistols in holsters, were assembled at the entrance to the camp: the Blockführer. It looked as though all were going to go well.

A whistle blew, and the Blockführer spread out fan-wise, each toward the Block which it was his responsibility to oversee. Each one made his count and compared his figure with that which the Block Chief handed him. "*Richtig*" (Correct). One by one the Blockführer came to report to the Rapportführer who waited, pencil in hand, and who wrote down the figures as they were given him.

There was not one discordant note; the roll-call would not last long. The S.S. wanted to take advantage of this Sunday and were moving fast. We were exultant: one day of rest with nothing to do but to eat our soup and to stretch out in the sun.

Just a minute! The total number of prisoners which the Rapportführer had did not tally with the figure given to him by the Arbeitsstatistik; there were twenty-seven fewer men on the grounds than on the paper. Question: what had become of them? The Kapo of the Arbeitsstatistik was sent for in a hurry. He was asked to go over his figures right away. One hour later he came back, with the same figure. Perhaps, then, the S.S. had made a mistake. The count was made again, and the Rapportführer came up with the same figure. They searched through the Blocks, they searched through the Tunnel; they found none of the missing prisoners.

It was noon. The ten thousand or so prisoners were still on the grounds waiting for the figures of the Arbeitsstatistik and of the S.S.-Führung to agree. Time dragged; some men fainted: those whose turn it was to die fell down, never to get up again; those with dysentery relieved themselves as they stood; the Lagerschutz felt that things were getting slack and began to lay about. The S.S. guards whose Sunday was threatened were furious. They went off to eat, but we stayed there. At two o'clock they came back.

Suddenly the Kapo of the Arbeitsstatistik came running: he had come up with another figure. A murmur of hope rose from the crowd. The Rapportführer looked over the new figure and became violently angry: there were still eight men missing. The Kapo of the Arbeitsstatistik went away again. He came back at four. Now no more than five men were missing. At eight only one was still missing, and we were still there, pale, drawn, and exhausted, after having stood for eleven hours, with empty stomachs. The S.S. decided to send us to eat. We left. Behind us the Totenkommando picked up some thirty dead.

At nine, it all began again, in an attempt to find the missing man. At eleven forty-five, after various comings and goings, this missing man was found, too; the S.S.-Führung and the

Arbeitsstatistik were in agreement. We went back to our Blocks and were able to go to bed, again leaving behind us ten or more dead.

There you have the explanation of why the roll-calls took so long. Those employed in the Arbeitsstatistik, illiterate or nearly so, had been made bookkeepers only as a favour, and they were incapable of adding up at the first count the number of men present. The concentration camp was a world where every man's place was determined by his connections and his cunning and not by his abilities. Accountants were made masons, carpenters became accountants, wheelwrights became doctors, and doctors became fitters, electricians or road-graders.

From Paul Rassinier: *The Holocaust Story and the Lies of Ulysses*, Institute for Historical Review, 1978, pp. 74-77

Dora and Jews

Paul Rassinier

On June 30, 1937, Buchenwald was only what its name means, a forest of beech trees, a place perched on a foot hill of the Harz mountains, five and a half miles from Weimar. One reached it by a stony, winding path. One day some men came by car to the foot of the hill. They climbed to the top on foot, as though it were an excursion. They carefully inspected the area. One of them pointed out a clearing; then they returned after having had a good luncheon at Weimar.

“Unser Führer wird zufrieden werden,” they said. (Our Fuhrer will be pleased.)

Sometime later others came. They were chained together by fives, one to the other and constituted a detachment of a hundred men, surrounded by about twenty S.S., guns in hand. There was no more room in the German prisons. They climbed up the path as best they could, sworn at and kicked. When they reached the top exhausted, they were put to work without any delay. A group of fifty put up tents for the S.S., while the other group put in place a circle of barbed wire, three strands high and about a hundred yard in diameter. The first day that was all that could be done. They ate a meagre meal in a hurry and almost without stopping work and, very late in the evening, they went to sleep right on the ground, wrapped in thin coverings. The next day, the first group of fifty unloaded all day long construction materials and sections of wooden barracks which heavy tractors managed to bring about half way up the hill; they carried this material the rest of the way up on their backs and placed it inside the barbed wire. The second group cut down trees to clear the area. They did not eat that day because they had started off in the first place with food for one day only. But, they slept better that night in the shelter of the branches and among the piles of boards.

Beginning with the third day, sections of barracks began to arrive at a faster rate and began to pile up half way up the hill. There were also a kitchen outfit, quantities of striped clothing, some tools, and some supplies. The S.S. stated in their daily report that with one hundred men they could not keep up with material delivered. Others were sent them. The rations then were insufficient. At the end of the week, some fifty S.S. struggled with about a thousand prisoners who they did not know where to put at night, who they could barely feed, and who overwhelmed their ability to supervise. The prisoners were made up into several groups, or Kommandos, each detailed to a particular job: the kitchen for the S.S., the orderlies for their camp, the kitchen of the prisoners, the construction of the barracks, the transport of material, the administration accounting. All of these operations were called S.S. Küche, Häftlingsküche, Barrakenkommando Bauleitung, Arbeitsstatistik, etc., and on paper, in reports, it looked like a simple and methodical organization. But it was, in fact, a complete mess, a horrible swarming of men, who went through the motion of eating, who worked haphazardly, and who barely slept covered in a jumble of branches and boards. Since it was easier to keep them under surveillance when they

were working than when they were sleeping, the days were twelve, fourteen or sixteen hours long. Since there were not enough guards, they were forced to select a complement of trustees out of the whole lot of the prisoners on appearances alone, who, since they had uneasy consciences, created a reign of terror by way of excusing and justifying themselves. Blows rained, not just insults and threats.

The bad treatment, the poor and insufficient food, the super-human work, the lack of medicines, and the pneumonia created conditions that caused this gang of men to die at an alarming rate, endangering the general health. The S.S. had to think of another way to get rid of the bodies other than by burial which took too much time and which was too often repeated: so they had turned to cremation, a procedure that was much faster and in conformity with Germanic traditions. Another Kommando, in its turn, became indispensable, the Totenkommando, and the construction of a crematorium was put on the list of "urgent" work to be done. Thus it happened that a place was built for men to die in, before the place was built for them to live in. Everything is linked together: evil attracts evil, and when one is caught in the mesh of evil forces...

Moreover, the camp was not conceived in the minds of the National-Socialist authorities to be just a camp, but a community working under supervision for the building of the Third Reich, just like the other individuals of the German community who remained in relative liberty. As a consequence, after the crematorium came the factory, the Guzlow. So it is seen that the order of precedence for all the installations was determined first by the need to keep everything well under guard, second by hygienic requirements, and third by the demands of work that constituted the *raison d'être* for the camp. Everything was subordinate to the collective interest which trampled down and crushed the individual.

Buchenwald was thus, during the period of the first installations, a Straflager (punishment camp) where only those considered incorrigible in other prisons were sent. Then, from the moment that the factory, the Guzlow, was ready to go, an Arbeitslager (labor camp) with Strafkommandos. Finally, it was transformed into a Konzentrationslager (concentration camp) which is what it was when we knew it, a camp equipped with all the amenities of a small city, where everyone was sent without discrimination. Around the central camp there were satellite camps, which it kept supplied with human material. All the camps went through these three stages successively. Unfortunately, with the war breaking out, prisoners from all places, of all kinds, in for all kinds of reasons, and under all kinds of disciplinary punishment, were haphazardly, because of the disorder of the circumstances, and indiscriminately sent to a Straflager, an Arbeitslager, or a Konzentrationslager. The result was a frightening mixture of all kinds of humanity which resembled, under the sign of the truncheon, a gigantic basket of crabs, over which National-Socialism, so sure of itself and so methodical in its operations, but overwhelmed on all sides by events which were beginning to master it, threw an immense Noah's mantle.

Dora was born under the sponsorship of Buchenwald and in the same way. It grew and prospered following the same process.

In 1903, German engineers and chemists had discovered that the stone of the Harz mountains in that area was rich in ammonia. Since no private company was willing to risk capital in its extraction, the Government undertook it. Germany did not possess, as did her neighbors,

colonies that were able to put at her disposal men from Cayenne or Nouméa. Because of this fact, together with the fact that she was obliged to keep her convicts inside the country, they were imprisoned in certain places where they were used for especially disagreeable labor. As a consequence, a convict prison, like all convict prisons in the world, except for a few minor differences, was created at Dora. In 1910, for reasons unknown, but most likely because the yield of ammonia was much smaller than was anticipated, quarrying the stone was stopped. It was resumed during the war of 1914-1918, as a sort of punitive camp for prisoners of war at a time when Germany was already beginning to think of going underground to escape some of the devastation of bombing. Again the operation was interrupted by the Armistice. Between the two wars, Dora was completely forgotten: wild tangled growth masked the entrance to the excavations and, all around, vast fields of sugar-beets were cultivated to supply the sugar refinery at Nordhausen, three and a half miles away.

It was into these beet fields that on September 1, 1943, Buchenwald disgorged a first well escorted Kommando of two hundred men. Germany, again feeling the need to go underground or at least to put her war industries underground, had taken up the project of 1915 again. Construction of the S.S. camp and of the crematorium was begun, underground factory was set up, and the kitchens, showers, the Arbeitstatistik, the Revier, or infirmary, were built, last of all. So long as the underground work existed, the S.S. delayed as long as possible, putting off always a little longer, the unprofitable work of constructing Blocks for the prisoners, preferring instead to dig the gallery of the tunnel farther in, and to make it possible to get as many factories as possible under protect from the ever increasing threats from the open sky.

When we arrived at Dora, the camp was still in the Straflager stage. We made an Arbeitslager out of it. When we left it with its 170 Blocks, its infirmary, its theater, its brothel, and with all its installations in place and its tunnel completed, it was on the point of becoming a Konzentrationslager. Already, at the other end of the double tunnel, there was another camp, Ellrich, its offspring, and which was itself in the Straflager stage. There could be no break in the descending curve of human misery.

But, the English and Americans and the Russians had decided otherwise, and, on April 11, 1945, they came to free us. Since then the penitentiary system of East Germany has been in the hands of the Russians who haven't changed things a fraction. Tomorrow, it will be in the hands of... who knows? Since there must be no gap in history.

A concentration camp, when it is completely set up, is a regular city which is isolated from the outside world which conceived it, which is surrounded by fences of electrified barbed wire, and which is guarded with special guards every fifty yards on platforms, armed to the teeth. To make the screen between the two even more dense, an S.S. garrison bordered the camp and at a distance of three or four miles all around sentinels were encamped. Thus, anyone trying to escape would have a certain number of obstacles to overcome, or perhaps it would be better to say that any attempt would be doomed to failure. This isolated city had its own laws and its own particular social phenomena. Any ideas born there, individually or collectively, were stopped at the barbed wire and remained unsuspected by the rest of the world. By the same token, almost

everything that took place in the outer world, was unknown on the inside, any penetration being made almost impossible by that screen. Newspapers came in; but, they were carefully selected and said nothing but those things that had been especially printed for the inmates in the concentration camp. It did happen in wartime that the “news” for the concentration camp inmates was the same as that which the Germans were supposed to take as gospel, and that is why the newspapers were the same for both, but it was pure chance. Use of the radio was punishable. It follows that camp life, organized on the other moral and sociological principles, had quite a different orientation from that of normal life. As a consequence, it revealed aspects that could not be judged by standards common to mankind in general. But, it was a city, and a human city.

Inside – or on the outside, but near by – a factory was the reason for its existence and its means of existence: at Buchenwald, the Guzlow; at Dora, the Tunnel. The factory was the keystone of the entire edifice, and its needs, which had to be satisfied, were the iron laws. The camp was made for the factory, and not the factory to keep the camp busy.

The most important department of the camp was the Arbeitsstatistik, which kept a strict accounting of the entire population, and kept track of each man day after day in his work. At the Arbeitsstatistik the personnel could tell you at any moment whatsoever of the day what each prisoner was doing and where he could be found. This department, like all the others, too, was entrusted to prisoner trustees and kept busy a considerable and privileged number of them.

Then came the Politische-Abteilung, which kept track of the political aspects of the camp and which was able to give for any prisoner any information wanted about his previous life, his moral conduct, the reasons for his arrest... It was the department of the anthropometry of the camp, its Sicherheitsdienst (security police), and employed only those prisoners in whom the S.S. had confidence. Once again the privileged.

Then the Verwaltung, or the general administration, which kept track of everything that came into the camp: food, material, clothing, etc... It was the quartermaster of the camp. Those prisoners employed in office work always occupied a privileged position.

These three big departments ran the camp. They had at their head a Kapo who ran them under the supervision of a non-commissioned officer of the S.S., or Rapportführer. There was a Rapportführer for all the key services, and each one of them reported every evening to the Rapportführer-general of the camp, who was an officer, generally an Oberleutnant. This Rapportführer-general communicated with the prison camp through the intermediary of his subordinates and the Lagerältester, or the doyen of the prisoners, who was responsible in general for the camp and who answered for its smooth running even with his life.

Similarly, the departments of the second level: the Sanitätsdienst, or health service, which included doctors, male nurses, disinfection, infirmary and crematorium services; the Lagerschutzpolizei, or camp police; the Feuerwerk, or fire protection; the Bunker, or jail for those prisoners caught breaking the rules of the camp; the Kino-Theater, or movie, and the brothel, or Pöuf.

There were also the Küche, or kitchen; the Effecktenkammer, or clothing store, which was attached to the Verwaltung; the Häftlingskantine, or canteen, which supplied the prisoners with extra food and drinks in exchange for the coin of the realm; the Bank, where the special money good only in the camp was issued.

And, now to describe the mass of workers... They were divided up into Blocks constructed on the same plan as that of Buchenwald 48, but of wood, and with only one floor. They lived there only at night. They returned there at night after roll-call at about nine o'clock, and they left every morning before dawn, at half past four. They were supervised by the Block Chiefs who were surrounded by their Schreiber, Friseur, Stubendienst, who were veritable satraps. The Block Chief governed life in the Block through the supervision of an S.S. soldier, or Blockführer, who reported to the Rapportführer-general. The Blockführer were only rarely seen; generally they confined themselves to one friendly visit with the Block Chief during the day, that is, when the prisoners were away, so that it was the latter who was in effect the only authority, and practically all of his exactions were without appeal.

The population of the camp, its social composition, and its origins were also elements that were de-humanizing. I have already remarked that National-Socialism drew no distinctions between political crime and common crime, and that consequently, there was in Germany no distinction between the civil and the political regime. As in the prisons of most civilized nations, there was something of everything in the camps – of everything and something else besides. All of the prisoners, whatever social or criminal element they came from, lived together, under the same regulations. The only thing that distinguished them was the colored triangle on their prison clothing which was the insignia of their classification – i.e. their reason for being there.

Red was reserved for political crimes. For common crimes, there was a green triangle; it was plain for Verbrecher, or petty crimes; it was embellished with an "S" for Schwerverbrecher, or serious crimes, and a "K" for Kriegsverbrecher, or war crimes. Thus, a gradation was made from common crimes, such as a simple theft, to murder and to the theft of supplies or armaments.

Between these two extremes, there was a whole series of intermediary crimes; the black triangle (professionally unemployed); the pink triangle (pederasts and homosexuals); the yellow triangle reversed over a red one so as to form a star (Jews); purple triangle (conscientious objectors). In addition, those who had done a certain term in prison, and then, following their release, were incarcerated again for committing new crimes wore instead of the triangle a black circle on white background with a large "Z" in the center, which stood for those freed from the Zuchthaus or prison. And, finally, those who wore a red triangle with the point up had committed minor crimes in the army and had been sentenced by a court-martial.

To these were added a few special ones: the red triangle with a transverse bar for those sent to the Konsett for the second or third time; three black dots on a yellow and white brassard for the blind; the Wifo, the same circle as for the Zuchthaus people with the "Z" replaced by a "W." These latter had originally been volunteer workers. They had been employed by the Wifo firm which had been the first to try to achieve the Cergeltungfeurer, the famous V1 and V2 rockets.

One fine day, and for no apparent reason, they got the striped clothes and were put into concentration camps. The secret of the V1 and V2 having gone through the trial period and into the intensive production stage was not to be freely circulated, even among the German people. In other words, they were interned for reasons of State security. The Wifo were the most unfortunate people in the camp: they continued to be paid their salary, half of which was paid them in the camp itself, the rest being sent to their families. They had the right to keep their hair and to write whenever they wanted to, on condition that they said nothing about what had happened to them; and since they were the best off, they introduced the black market into the camp and raised the exchange.

As far as the population was concerned, the concentration camps were regular towers of Babel in which personalities clashed because of differences of origin, of their sentences, and previous social standing. The common law offenders hated the political criminals whom they didn't understand, and the latter returned the feeling. The intellectuals looked down on the manual laborers, and the latter rejoiced to see the former "working at last." The Russians wrapped the whole of the West in the same icy contempt. The Poles and the Czechs couldn't stand the French, because of Munich etc... On the nationality level, there were enmities between the Slavs and Germanic people, between the Germans and the Italians, between the Dutch and the Belgians, or between the Dutch and the Germans. The French, who came last and began to receive the most magnificent parcels of food, were looked down on by everybody except the Belgians, who were pleasant, frank, and good. France was regarded as a land of milk and honey, and her inhabitants as sybaritic degenerates, who were incapable of work, who ate well, and who were occupied only with making love. To these sentiments the Spaniards added the concentration camps of Daladier. I remember having been accosted in Block 24 at Dora by a vigorous: "Ah! The French; now you know what a Lager means. No harm, it'll teach you!"

It was one of the three Spaniards (there were 26 in all at Dora) who had been interned at Gurs in 1938, enrolled in labor companies in 1939, and sent to Buchenwald after Rethel. The three maintained that the only difference between the French and the German camps was the work; all other things, treatment, food, being just about the same. In fact they added that the French camps were dirtier.

Oh, Jircszah!

The S.S. guards lived in a parallel camp. In general, they were a company. At first, this company was a training unit for young recruits, and only Germans were in it. Later on, the S.S. became more international in composition: Italians, Poles, Czechs, Bulgarians, Rumanians, Greeks, among others filled the ranks. The necessities of war had compelled the Germans to send the Young recruits to the front, often with limited military instruction, or even without any special preparation, and the young were replaced by the old, those who had already served in the war of 1914-1918, on whom National Socialism had made scarcely any imprint. They were less hard. In the last two years of the war, when there were not enough S.S., the rejects from the Wehrmacht and the Luftwaffe, who couldn't be used for anything else, were assigned as guards to the camps.

All the services of the camp had their parallel in the S.S. camp where everything was centralized, and from which daily or weekly reports were sent directly to Himmler's offices in Berlin. The S.S. camp was, therefore, the administrator of the other. When the camps were just beginning during the Straflager period, they were administered directly; afterwards, and as soon as possible, the S.S. carried on the camp administration only through the prisoners themselves as intermediaries. One would think that this arrangement was used out of sadism, and, after the war was over, that is what was said. But, it was really out of necessity to economize personnel that the system was used, and for that reason, in all prisons in all countries, the same situation holds. The S.S. itself only administered the camp when it was impossible for them to do otherwise. We know what self-government by the prisoners in the camps was. All of the old hands who have experienced both systems are unanimous in recognizing that the former was in principle the better and more humane, and that if it was not in fact, it was because wartime circumstances and the pressure of events did not permit it. I believe it; it is better to deal with God than with the saints.

So the S.S. guarded the perimeter of the camp, and it can be said that we hardly ever saw them inside the camp, except when they simply went through to take the salute of the prisoners, the famous "Müntzen ab." They were helped in their guard duty by a company of marvelously trained dogs, always ready to bite and capable of hunting out an escaped prisoner tens of miles away. Every morning, the Kommandos that were to work outside the camp, often they traveled three or four miles on foot – when they had to go farther, they used trucks or trains – were accompanied, according to their importance, by two or four S.S., guns in hand, each with a muzzled dog on a leash. This special guard, which complemented the surveillance of the Kapos, just kept watch from afar, and did not intervene in supervision of the prisoners unless a show of force was called for.

In the evening, at the roll-call by Block, when everyone was there, at a whistle, all the Blockführer turned toward the Block for which they were responsible, counted those present and then went back to report. During this operation non-coms went around the Blocks to enforce silence and attention. The Kapos, Block Chiefs, and Lagerschutz greatly helped them in making this task easy. From time to time an S.S. man stood out from the others for his brutality, but it was rare; and in no case was he ever more inhuman than the prisoner trustees who filled the positions that are mentioned in the preceding sentence.

Once again, my personal testimony: I refer to a group of Hungarian Jews whose convoy, originally bound for Auschwitz, had arrived at Dora at the end of May 1944. Of the 1,500 or so people of this convoy, a certain number were sent to satellite camps around Dora as soon as they arrived. How many remained with us I do not know; maybe they filled an entire block. Because of the racist policies of Nazism, they were to be completely isolated from the other prisoners. That block was surrounded by barbed wire. And from that protected block they went to work like everyone else, but as a separate Kommando. For them, assembly took place within the block, before their leaving for work and on their return. We envied them. Fifteen days after their arrival, if your clogs had been stolen in the night, if you wanted more bread, or if you required some tobacco or something else, you only had to make a quick dash to the Jewish block in the morning

between reveille and roll-call, or in the evening before lights out, and, in exchange for something else, you could get just about anything you wanted: it was a regular market. We admired them; at the gate of the camp they had been made to undress completely, and had been sent to be disinfected; they went in completely naked, their contact with the other prisoners was limited, and, all the same, they had succeeded in procuring a little of everything that could be obtained in the camp only with the greatest difficulties and at a very high price.

After a little while, the special surveillance over them became hardly more than a facade: once in a while we could exchange a few words with them, and even have short conversations. Thus it was that we learned about their odyssey. They told us about what they had had to leave behind when they came into the camp, and, since we were old hands in their eyes, they asked if they would get it back, when, how, and so on... They had been transported from Hungary to Dora, 70 to 80 persons in a car, with all of their baggage. They had made a long periplex of six to seven days before arriving. They had been told when leaving that they were being taken to Auschwitz, and when they learned that it was at Dora that they would be unloaded, they were pleased. They told the most appalling things about Auschwitz. There were neither women nor children among them. The latter had been separated out on departure, and at the moment it did not surprise us since that is what happened to us.

From Paul Rassinier: *The Holocaust Story and the Lies of Ulysses*, Institute for Historical Review, 1978, pp. 43-47, pp. 47-49, pp. 51-53, pp. 53-54, p. 365

Paul Rassinier

Operation „Stellvertreter“

Huldigung eines Ungläubigen

Damm Verlag München

Französische Originalausgabe: Opération „Vicaire“
Le rôle de Pie XII devant l'Histoire
La Table Ronde, Paris, 1965
Autorisierte Übersetzung von Jutta Groll

© 1966 by Damm Verlag GmbH, München
Printed in Germany
Umschlagentwurf: Karl Heinz Schneider, Mariabrunn
Druck: Buchdruckerei Hans Braun, Hausham/Oberbayern
Bindarbeiten: Dr. F. P. Datterer u. Cie., Inh. Sellier, Freising/Oberbayern

„Ich nenne Pöbel alles das,
was niedrig und gemein denkt:
Der Hof ist voll davon.“

MARQUISE DE LAMBERT

(Brief einer Dame an ihren Sohn
über den wahren Ruhm, 1726.)

Inhalt

Vorbemerkung des Verlags	9
Vorwort des Verfassers zur deutschen Ausgabe	11
Kapitel I: Falsche Fragestellungen	19
I. Die Anklageschrift	21
II. Das Recht auf dichterische Freiheit	40
III. Portrait des SS-Offiziers Kurt Gerstein	43
IV. Die Kronzeugen	51
V. Saul Friedländer und die deutschen Archive	63
VI. Die Verteidigung	80
Kapitel II: Das eigentliche Problem	95
I. Die Päpste und der Frieden	97
II. Die Bemühungen Pius' XII. um eine Verhinderung des Krieges	112
III. Die Bemühungen Pius' XI. um die Beendigung des Krieges	136
IV. Die diplomatischen Bemühungen des Vatikans	146
Kapitel III: Die politischen Hintergründe des Unternehmens	165
I. Der Versailler Vertrag als Ursache	167
II. Die Motive der Protestanten	173
III. Die Einheitsfront gegen den Papst	194
IV. Für den Frieden	199
Nachwort	205
Anhang I: Allgemeine Auffassung über Pius XII. bis zu Rolf Hochhuth	211
I. Le Populaire (3. 3. 1939)	211
II. L'Humanité (3. 3. 1939)	215
Anhang II: Selbstzeugnis Pius' XII.	219
Anhang III: Die Hauptargumente der Verteidiger Pius' XII.	226
Anhang IV: Kardinal Merry del Val und der Erste Weltkrieg	232
Anhang V: Das Problem der deutschen Reparationsschulden	236
Personenverzeichnis	239
Literaturverzeichnis	242
Bemerkungen zur elektronischen Fassung (Mai 2001)	245

Vorbemerkung des Verlags

Bei der Wiedergabe von Zitaten aus fremdsprachlichen Originalen standen Übersetzer und Verlag vor der schwierigen Entscheidung, ob eine Neuübersetzung vorgenommen werden oder bereits vorliegende deutsche Übersetzungen verwendet werden sollten. Wir haben uns zu dem zweiten Verfahren entschlossen, obwohl dadurch Verzerrungen unsichtbar bleiben, wie sie leider im zeitgeschichtlichen Bereich anscheinend absichtlich vorgenommen werden. Die Aufdeckung derartiger Manipulationen wäre eine Doktorarbeit wert.

Der Verfasser hat selbstverständlich bei Dokumenten mit den offiziellen französischen Versionen gearbeitet, die häufig stark von den deutschen abweichen. Von der Möglichkeit, in den Anmerkungen diese Differenzen aufzuzeigen, glaubten wir absehen zu dürfen. Bestimmend war hierfür der Wunsch, ein populär wissenschaftliches Werk nicht mit einem zu umfangreichen fachwissenschaftlichen Apparat zu belasten.

Zitate aus Texten deutschen Ursprungs sind in der Regel im Originalwortlaut wiedergegeben. In den wenigen Fällen, in denen die Originaltexte nicht beschafft werden konnten und die Zitate aus dem Französischen rückübersetzt werden mußten, ist dies ausdrücklich vermerkt.

Um einem möglichen Mißverständnis vorzubeugen, sei darauf hingewiesen, daß man in Frankreich als „protestantisch“ alles bezeichnet, was gegen die katholische Kirche oder gegen den Papst protestiert. Der deutsche Leser wird ohne Schwierigkeit unterscheiden, ob jeweils ein Glied der evangelischen Kirche gemeint ist oder nicht, wenn er sich nur dieser Gegebenheit erinnert.

Wer Paul Rassinier aus seinen früheren in Deutschland erschienenen Werken als Atheisten und unbeugsamen Freidenker kennt, mag sich verwundert fragen, was gerade ihn bewogen hat, sich mit dem „Stellvertreter“ zu beschäftigen. Ihm sei die Antwort gegeben, die der französische Verleger gefunden hat: „Weil er die Lüge verabscheut und weil er Pazifist ist.“

Vorwort des Verfassers zur deutschen Ausgabe

Als das Manuskript dieses Werkes am 20. Februar 1965 dem französischen Verleger übergeben wurde, war ein ganzer Komplex von Dokumenten, die gegenwärtig herausgegeben werden, der Öffentlichkeit noch völlig unbekannt. Die wichtigsten darunter sind die *Actes et documents du Saint-Siège relatifs à la seconde guerre mondiale*.

Der Verfasser hat es Rolf Hochhuth heftig zum Vorwurf gemacht, daß er sein Theaterstück in einer Weise schrieb, die keinen Widerspruch duldete, ohne diese Dokumente überhaupt zu kennen, und daß er dabei noch die Stirn hatte, dies sogar zuzugeben. Das gleiche gilt für Saul Friedländer, den einzigen qualifizierten Historiker — zumindest seinem Titel nach¹ —, der sich anmaßte, eine endgültige Meinung über das Verhalten Pius' XII. angesichts und während des Zweiten Weltkrieges äußern zu können, für Jacques Nobécourt, der sich unter dem trügerischen Vorwand, an einer kleinen französischen Universität ein wenig Geschichte studiert zu haben, gern den Anstrich eines Historikers gibt, obwohl er sein Geschichtsstudium mittendrin aufgab, um sich der Politik zuzuwenden, sowie für alle anderen Gegner Pius' XII. Es ist ganz offensichtlich, daß eine solche Verfahrensweise, ohne Rücksicht auf die goldene Regel des Historikers, die Objektivität, zwangsläufig zu einer einseitigen Darstellung der Dinge führte.

Als erstes könnte nun dem Leser der Gedanke kommen, daß der Verfasser selbst in den Fehler verfallen ist, den er den anderen vorwirft, da ja diese Dokumente zu der Zeit, als er sein Buch schrieb, noch unveröffentlicht waren, und daß er ebenfalls eine einseitige Darstellung der Dinge, nur aus der entgegengesetzten Sicht, gegeben hat. Dies trifft jedoch nicht zu.

Zunächst einmal hat der Verfasser, der auf Grund seines Gesundheitszustandes im Anschluß an einen neunzehnmonatigen

¹ Doktor der politischen Wissenschaften der Universität Genf, Lehrbeauftragter für Zeitgeschichte am Institut universitaire des Hautes Études internationales in Genf. Sein Buch zeigt, auf welch mittelmäßiges Niveau die engagierten Intellektuellen unserer Zeit gesunken sind.

Aufenthalt in den deutschen Konzentrationslagern nicht in der Lage war, seinen Lehrstuhl wieder einzunehmen, seine ganze Zeit damit verbracht, die Dokumente der 13 Nürnberger Prozesse (allein 67 Bände), und des 14., der in Jerusalem stattfand, eingehend zu untersuchen sowie alle diejenigen, die amtlich von der britischen und der amerikanischen Regierung veröffentlicht worden sind. Und diese Dokumentation genügte für sich allein schon, um sich über das Verhalten Pius' XII. eine Meinung zu bilden.

Zur größeren Sicherheit jedoch, um nicht leichtfertig in diese Auseinandersetzung einzutreten und um sich — im Gegensatz zu all denen, die gegen Pius XII. geschrieben haben — bei dieser Materie den Geboten der Geschichtsforschung zu unterwerfen, wollte er auch die einzigen noch unbekannten Quellen heranziehen: Er begab sich im Juni 1964 nach Rom, wo er etwa einen Monat mit ihrem Studium zubrachte. Dabei konnte er dank der äußersten Zuvorkommenheit und durch die Vermittlung von Pater Robert Leiber SJ, der 34 Jahre lang Privatsekretär Pius' XII. war, seine eigene, den obenerwähnten Quellen entnommene Dokumentation mit der des Vatikans vergleichen. Damit soll gesagt werden, daß dem Verfasser zu dem Zeitpunkt, als er sein Buch schrieb, von der Dokumentation des Vatikans nichts unbekannt war. Der Leser, der über die Mittel verfügt, sich diese Dokumentation anzuschaffen², wird sich bei der Lektüre der bereits erschienenen ersten beiden Bände leicht davon überzeugen: Sämtliche darin enthaltenen Schriftstücke, die in irgendeinem Zusammenhang mit der hier verfochtenen These stehen, sind in dem vorliegenden Werk inhaltlich und in ihrer genauen Bedeutung angeführt.

Zu Inhalt und Bedeutung soll daher in diesem Vorwort nur noch ein Wort gesagt werden, und auch nur, weil es in einer Arbeit, die den Anspruch erhebt, keinen der Aspekte des gestellten Problems außer acht gelassen zu haben, nicht möglich ist, darüber stillschweigend hinwegzugehen. Der erste Band, der sich auf den Zeitraum vom März 1939 bis August 1940 erstreckt, bringt auf 552 Seiten 379 Dokumente. Er beweist in überreichem Maße, daß Pius XII. in dieser Zeit das einzige Staatsoberhaupt, wenn auch

² Jeder Band kostet zwischen 40 und 50 DM, und es sind zehn solcher Bände geplant.

eines der kleinsten Staaten der Welt, war, das die Überzeugung hatte, es sei noch möglich, den Krieg durch eine internationale Konferenz zu vermeiden. Durch eine Konferenz nämlich, die sich zum Ziel gesetzt hätte, den Versailler Vertrag einer korrekten Revision zu unterziehen und ein Werk daraus zu machen, das allen Völkern, einschließlich des deutschen, Gerechtigkeit widerfahren ließe, und damit — auch wenn Hitler in Deutschland herrschte — Europa Garantien für einen dauerhaften Frieden zu geben. Man lächelt mitleidig bei dem Gedanken, daß Churchill zehn Jahre nach dem Krieg in seinen *Mémoires*³ schrieb: „Kein Krieg war jemals leichter zu vermeiden als dieser.“ Pius XII. hatte das *vorher* gesehen, nicht *hinterher*. Man muß ihm daher wohl die Huldigung darbringen, daß er die größte und vornehmste Gestalt des Pazifismus in unserer Zeit war.

Der zweite Band enthält 124 Schreiben aus der Kriegszeit an die katholischen Bischöfe Deutschlands: Alle 124 sind Ermutigungen zum Widerstand gegen die Unternehmungen des Nationalsozialismus. Man kann dies bedauern oder begrüßen. Aber das ist nicht die Frage, die sich dem Historiker stellt: Der Historiker muß lediglich aufzeichnen, daß diese Briefe existieren und daß sie diesen Inhalt haben. Das übrige ist nicht Sache der Geschichte, sondern der Geschichtsphilosophie. Jeder Historiker aber hat seine eigene Auffassung von der Geschichte und untersteht nur einem einzigen Gebot, das gemeinhin so definiert wird: „Die Tatsachen sind heilig, der Kommentar ist frei.“ Es stimmt, daß diese Briefe von Ratschlägen zur Vorsicht durchzogen sind — die Umstände geboten es. Doch sind sie deswegen nicht weniger bedeutsam: Pius XII. war bis ins Innerste ein Gegner des Nationalsozialismus. Daneben zeigen sie ihn voller Angst und Spannung, unaufhörlich auf Ausschau nach der Gelegenheit, das Ende der Heimsuchung, dieses unerträglichen „gegenseitigen Mordens“⁴, sowie „die Rückkehr zu den Grundsätzen der Gerechtigkeit und des wahrhaften Friedens“⁵ herbeizuführen. Sie zeigen ihn, wie er gegen all die Grausamkeiten

³ Bd. I, S. 68 der französischen Ausgabe.

⁴ Schreiben an den Berliner Bischof Graf von Preysing vom 30. April 1943. (Siehe Anhang)

⁵ Weihnachtsbotschaft 1939. (Rückübers. — Anm. d. Übers.)

dieses unmenschlichen Krieges protestiert, „in gleicher Sorge (gegenüber) allen Kriegsopfern, allen materiell oder seelisch unter der Kriegsnot Leidenden ... in Deutschland ... wie in der übrigen Welt ... auf der einen oder anderen Seite ... gleichviel, ob die Betroffenen Kinder der Kirche oder Außenstehende sind⁶“, gegenüber jenen „Hunderttausenden, die ... nur um ihrer ... Abstammung (oder Religion) willen dem Tode geweiht oder einer fortschreitenden Verelendung preisgegeben sind⁷“ usw.

Alle diese Texte sind in diesem Werk angeführt, obgleich sie zu dem Zeitpunkt, an dem das Buch geschrieben wurde, noch in keiner Weise offiziell verbürgt waren. Wir sagen das hier noch einmal, um sie hervorzuheben und deutlich zu zeigen, daß entgegen der Behauptung Hochhuths in seinem Drama die Juden nicht „um ihrer ... Abstammung willen“, wie es oben hieß, von der Fürsorge Pius' XII. ausgeschlossen waren. Wir haben festgestellt, daß Pius XII. in seinen öffentlichen Erklärungen und in seinen Schreiben 115mal diese oder ähnliche Formulierungen verwendet hat.

Es soll hier auch noch einmal jene andere Formel hervorgehoben werden: „... allen materiell oder seelisch unter der Kriegsnot Leidenden ... in Deutschland ... wie in der übrigen Welt ... auf der einen oder anderen Seite ...“. Sie schließt ganz offensichtlich die Bombenangriffe der Engländer und Amerikaner gegen die deutsche Zivilbevölkerung ein, die ebenso ein Kriegsverbrechen waren wie die Greuelthaten in den Konzentrationslagern. Man hat ihm einen Vorwurf daraus gemacht⁸. Doch mit welchem Recht, mit Verlaub, waren die Kriegsverbrechen, die von seiten der Alliierten begangen wurden, geheiliger als die von den Deutschen begangenen?

Kurz, diese beide Bände mit diplomatischen Dokumenten des Vatikans zum Zweiten Weltkrieg beweisen für sich allein schon, daß der Pius XII. Hochhuths, der durch die Herren Friedländer, Nobécourt und wie sie alle heißen, verbürgt wird, mit der wahren historischen Gestalt nichts gemein hat, und wenn Hochhuth ihn uns trotzdem als einen pronazistischen oder gegenüber dem Schick-

⁶ Schreiben an Bischof von Preysing, a. a. O.

⁷ Weihnachtsbotschaft 1942. (S. Text, Anm. 19 — Anm. d. Übers.)

⁸ Vgl. unten S. 34

sal der Juden gleichgültigen Papst zeigt, so ist das nichts anderes als eine Infamie. Dies ist die These, die in dem vorliegenden Werk verfochten wird, und sie erhält durch die neu veröffentlichten Dokumente ihre offizielle Bestätigung.

Auch möchte der Verfasser sein Werk den deutschen Lesern nicht präsentieren, ohne noch ein Wort zu einem Buch zu sagen, das er nur am Rande erwähnt hat: *The Catholic Church and Nazi Germany* von Guenter Lewy⁹.

Am 20. Februar 1965, dem Tag, an dem unser Manuskript dem französischen Verleger übergeben wurde, war lediglich die amerikanische Fassung des Buches von Lewy veröffentlicht.

In einem populärwissenschaftlichen Geschichtswerk, das sich an die breite Öffentlichkeit wendet, ist es nicht tunlich, sich auf Texte zu beziehen, die der Leser nicht nachprüfen kann. Auf jeden Fall ist dies nicht die Methode des Verfassers. Obgleich er den Inhalt des Buches kannte, hat er sich daher darauf beschränkt, in einer Fußnote zu sagen, daß Friedländer seine Anregungen weitgehend daraus bezog.

Inzwischen ist die Abhandlung von Lewy in Europa veröffentlicht worden. Jedermann kann auf sie verweisen, und die kurze Notiz, die in dem vorliegenden Werk dazu gemacht ist, genügt nicht mehr. Es muß ein Wort zu der Abhandlung selbst gesagt werden.

Worin besteht sie?

Im wesentlichen in einer Erklärung, wie der Nationalsozialismus in Deutschland mit der von Pius XII. verbürgten Hilfe der katholischen Kirche Deutschlands an die Macht gelangte. Ein nicht zu überbietender Schwindel!

Zunächst einmal ist zu sagen, daß das religiöse Moment bei der Machtergreifung Hitlers in Deutschland nur eine sekundäre Rolle spielte: Wenn die Deutschen, ob Protestanten oder Katholiken, unabhängig von ihrer religiösen Überzeugung in Massen ihre Stimmen für Hitler abgaben, so nicht, weil sie Protestanten oder Katholiken waren, sondern weil sie 1932/33 glaubten, Hitler sei der einzige Politiker, der sie aus den Fesseln des Versailler Vertrages be-

⁹ Deutsche Ausgabe: *Die katholische Kirche und das Dritte Reich*, (Anm. d. Übers.)

freien könne, jenes Vertrages, den sie, im übrigen mit vollem Recht, für ihr gesamtes Unglück, insbesondere die miserablen wirtschaftlichen Verhältnisse, in denen sie lebten, verantwortlich machten. Wenn das religiöse Moment in dieser Angelegenheit eine Rolle gespielt hat, so nur auf Grund der Stellungnahme der Geistlichkeit einer jeden der beiden wichtigsten Kirchen Deutschlands gegenüber dem Versailler Vertrag einerseits und gegenüber Hitler andererseits.

Gegenüber dem Versailler Vertrag: In dem Deutschland des Jahres 1932/33 waren die Geistlichkeit sämtlicher Kirchen, die Führer aller politischen und philosophischen Richtungen, aller Parteien sowie die öffentliche Meinung einmütig gegen den Vertrag und forderten seine Revision (in Übereinstimmung übrigens mit Artikel 19 der Völkerbundsakte, der diese Revision vorsah).

Gegenüber Hitler: Die protestantische Geistlichkeit war in ihrer Mehrheit *für*, der katholische Klerus *gegen* ihn. Während bis zum 23. März 1933 der zur Konferenz in Fulda zusammengetretene katholische Episkopat Deutschlands am Vorabend jeder Wahl einmütig die Mitglieder der NSDAP exkommunizierte und der Wählerschaft empfahl, nicht für ihre Kandidaten zu stimmen, umfaßte die protestantische Geistlichkeit, wie uns William L. Shirer sagt, 17 000 Pastoren, von denen 3000 aktive Kämpfer der NSDAP waren (der bekannteste von ihnen war Pastor Martin Niemöller, der heutige Kryptokommunist) und der Rest bis auf sehr wenige Ausnahmen aus Überzeugung auf Hitlers Seite stand.

Es wäre gar nicht einmal nötig, diese Tatsache, die durch unwiderlegbare Texte fest untermauert wird, anzuführen, um mit einem einzigen Schlag die These Guenter Lewys über die Verantwortlichkeit der katholischen Kirche Deutschlands und Pius' XII. an der Machtergreifung Hitlers zunichte zu machen: Der einfache gesunde Menschenverstand sagt, daß, wenn sich in dem Deutschland von 1932/33, dessen Bevölkerung zu ungefähr zwei Dritteln protestantisch und nur zu etwa einem Drittel katholisch war (5—6% gehörten keiner der beiden Kirchen an), die Deutschen auf Grund ihrer religiösen Überzeugung für Hitler ausgesprochen hätten, die protestantische Kirche die größere Verantwortung trüge, da sie in Deutschland zahlenmäßig überwog.

Lewy fühlt im übrigen selbst sehr wohl, daß seine These unhaltbar ist, denn er empfindet das Bedürfnis, dem Leser jenen trügerischen Grund anzugeben, weshalb er über das Verhalten und Schicksal (er sagt nicht Rolle) der protestantischen Kirche schwieg:

„Ich habe der Versuchung widerstanden, das Verhalten und das Schicksal der katholischen und der protestantischen Kirche unter Hitler miteinander zu vergleichen. Eine solche komplexe Frage müßte in einem gesonderten Buch behandelt werden; kurze Andeutungen zu diesem Problemkreis wären eher irreführend als informativ¹⁰.“

Vermutlich hat er dieser „Versuchung“ sehr freudig „widerstanden“. Diese Methode ermöglichte es ihm, die Verantwortlichkeiten zu verlagern, imaginäre Verantwortlichkeiten für die katholische Kirche Deutschlands zu schaffen und über die sehr realen der protestantischen Kirche zu schweigen. Auf diese Weise hat er nicht nur den Leser lediglich über seine eigenen gedanklichen Konstruktionen informiert, sondern vielmehr ihn irreführt!

Der deutsche Leser wird es vielleicht sonderbar finden, daß der Verfasser ein 1963 in Deutschland bei der *Basilius Presse* in der Reihe *Theater unserer Zeit* erschienenen Buch: *Der Streit um Hochbuths „Stellvertreter“* völlig mit Stillschweigen übergangen hat. In diesem Werk sind von verschiedenen Verfassern, von denen nur ein einziger Zeuge der Ereignisse ist, nämlich Pater Robert Leiber SJ, verschiedene Standpunkte zum Ausdruck gebracht. Bei den übrigen Verfassern handelt es sich um Schriftsteller, nicht um Historiker. Keiner von ihnen leistet zur Diskussion einen Beitrag, der als positiv oder neu angesehen werden könnte. Alle diejenigen, die sich nicht entschieden gegen Pius XII. aussprechen, sind sehr zurückhaltend und gehen am eigentlichen Problem vorbei. Selbst der Beitrag Pater Leibers steht weit unter dem, was er bei anderen Gelegenheiten geäußert hat. Deshalb sei die Schrift hier lediglich erwähnt, damit der deutsche Leser nicht denkt, der Verfasser habe sie nicht gekannt.

10. April 1966

Paul Rassinier

¹⁰ S. 12 der französischen Ausgabe. (Zitiert nach der deutschen Ausgabe S. 10 — Anm. d. Übers.)

Kapitel I

Falsche Fragestellungen

I. DIE ANKLAGESCHRIFT

„Als der junge Jesuit Riccardo Fontana durch den SS-Offizier Gerstein Kenntnis davon erhält, auf welche Weise die verschleppten Juden im Konzentrationslager Auschwitz in dem durch die Deutschen besetzten Teile Polens vernichtet werden, beschwört er den damaligen Papst Pius XII. — wir schreiben das Jahr 1943 —, sich zum Anwalt der verfolgten Juden zu machen und eine ausdrückliche und formelle Verdammung auszusprechen. Der Papst, der sich auf seinen Auftrag beruft, ein Vater der gesamten Menschheit zu sein, und der daran erinnert, daß er sein Mitleid niemals versagt habe, spricht nicht die von Riccardo erwarteten Worte. Daraufhin mischt dieser sich unter einen Transport römischer Juden, die praktisch *unter den Fenstern des Papstes* verhaftet worden waren. Er wird mit ihnen nach Auschwitz deportiert und dort in die Gaskammer geschickt. *Dieser armselige kleine Priester wird also, wenn es darauf ankommt, dort, wo jetzt der Papst der Stellvertreter Christi sein sollte, dessen wahrhafter Stellvertreter sein*².“

Diesen als historisch begründet hingestellten Tatbestand nahm Rolf Hochhuth, ein bis dahin unbekannter junger deutscher Protestant, zum Anlaß, ein Theaterstück zu schreiben. Es trägt den Titel: *Der Stellvertreter*. In diesem Stück sehen wir einen mit dem Nationalsozialismus sympathisierenden Papst, dessen gesamtes Denken von der Vorstellung überschattet wird, daß, wenn Hitler den Krieg verlöre, dies gleichbedeutend wäre mit der Auslieferung Europas an das Schlimmste, was es für die Kirche gibt: an den Bolschewismus. Der Papst ist daher bemüht, die, wie er weiß, nur noch dürftigen Aussichten Hitlers auf einen Sieg über den Bolschewismus nicht zu gefährden, und bereitet ihm sowenig Schwierigkeiten wie möglich. Dies geht so weit, daß er, obwohl im Besitz der magischen Kraft, mit einem Wort den Judenverfolgungen Einhalt zu gebieten, nicht nur dieses Wort, das er aus eigenem Antrieb hätte finden müssen, unausgesprochen läßt, sondern es sogar verweigert, als er darum gebeten wird. Um das Bild zu vervollständigen: Er wäscht seine befleckten Hände und deutet damit an, daß er jegliche Verantwortung

² Jacques Nobécourt, *Le Vicaire et l'histoire*, S. 9

für das weitere Schicksal der Juden ablehnt. Als man nicht nachläßt, bricht er, der Bitten überdrüssig, das Thema ab und geht zu einer anderen Frage über, die für die Kirche, deren Oberhaupt er ist, weitaus größere Bedeutung hat. Es ist dies die Frage der Kapitalbeteiligungen der Kirche an einer bestimmten Anzahl von Industriebetrieben, mit deren Zerstörung durch die Alliierten mit großer Wahrscheinlichkeit zu rechnen ist und die es, wenn man der Kirche einen finanziellen Verlust ersparen will, zu verkaufen gilt, bevor es zu spät ist. Und an wen sollte man sie verkaufen? Nun, an eben diese Alliierten! Seine mangelnde Sympathie ihnen gegenüber, die das ganze Stück hindurch nicht verborgen bleibt, wird hier überdeutlich: Die Alliierten würden auf diese Weise ihr eigenes Vermögen vernichten, während er selbst — ganz gleich, welchen Ausgang der Krieg auch nehmen würde — keinerlei Schwierigkeiten hinsichtlich einer Rückerstattung zu befürchten brauchte, da er diese schon vorher erhalten haben würde. So sehen zumindest die Vorstellungen aus, die dem scharfsinnigen Zuschauer in diesem Zusammenhang vermittelt werden. Der Autor geht zwar nicht so weit, zu behaupten, dieser Papst sähe in Hitler einen Boten der Vorsehung, der gekommen sei, um gleichzeitig mit dem Bolschewismus durch die Auslöschung des jüdischen Volkes — endlich! — auch den schon zwei Jahrtausende währenden Streit zwischen Juden und Christen aus der Welt zu schaffen — doch läge das nicht fern. Hochhuth jedenfalls hält mit seiner Meinung nicht hinter dem Berge, wenn er sagt:

„Ein solcher Papst ist . . . ein Verbrecher³!“

Und das soll Pius XII. gewesen sein!

In Originalfassung und unter Originaltitel gelangte *Der Stellvertreter* in Berlin am 20. Februar 1963, in Basel am 3. Dezember und in Wien am 27. Januar 1964 zur Erstaufführung. In Übersetzung wurde das Stück in London am 21. Juni 1963 (unter dem Titel *The Representative*), in Paris am 9. Dezember 1963 (als *Le Vicaire*) und in New York am 28. Februar 1964 (als *The Deputy*) uraufgeführt. So seltsam das erscheinen mag, in Tel Aviv wurde es zuletzt, nämlich erst am 20. Juni 1964, herausgebracht:

³ Rolf Hochhuth, *Der Stellvertreter*, S. 83

Die beiden Hauptinteressenten an der allgemeinen Verbreitung des in dem Drama behandelten Themas, die Weltbewegung des Zionismus und der Staat Israel, dürfen es sich als Verdienst anrechnen, diese Angelegenheit nicht als erste aufgegriffen zu haben. Zu bemerken ist ferner, daß das Stück zwar ins Italienische übersetzt, in Rom jedoch bisher immer noch nicht gespielt wurde. Auch in Moskau fand noch keine Aufführung statt. Der Grund hierfür — man mag sich dazu stellen, wie man will — ist im ersten Falle darin zu suchen, daß das Papsttum in Friedenszeiten in Italien noch über genügend Einfluß verfügt, um sich Verhöhnungen vor der eigenen Tür zu verbitten⁴, auch wenn seine Macht im Kriege, als es von allen Seiten eingekreist war, nicht ausreichte, die Festnahme von Juden an eben dieser Stelle zu verhindern. Im Falle Moskaus dürfte der Grund in der Chruschtschowschen Annäherungspolitik gegenüber dem Vatikan liegen, die auch für seine Nachfolger richtunggebend zu bleiben scheint.

In Berlin, London, Basel, Paris und New York lösten die ersten Aufführungen im Theater und auf der Straße feindselige Demonstrationen aus, die das Einschreiten der Polizei erforderlich machten. In intellektuellen Kreisen entbrannten leidenschaftliche Diskussionen, deren Ende noch nicht abzusehen ist. In Wien war die Reaktion zwar nicht geringer und nicht weniger entschieden, doch blieb der Protest der öffentlichen Meinung korrekt und in Grenzen. Auch in Israel verhielt man sich korrekt. Zwar entstand eine Diskussion darüber, ob es zweckmäßig sei, das Stück dort aufzuführen, doch führte das nur dazu, die Generalprobe um einige Monate hin-

⁴ Die Genehmigung für eine römische Aufführung des *Stellvertreter* durch den italienischen Staat würde bedeuten, daß dieser zuvor das Konkordat von 1929 aufkündigen müßte, durch das ihm die Erteilung einer solchen Genehmigung gegen die Meinung des Papstes untersagt ist. Angesichts der engen Bindung des italienischen Volkes — auch der Kommunisten, wie es das Beispiel des *Don Camillo* von Guareschi zeigt — an die katholische Kirche wird man verstehen, daß keine Regierung, auch nicht die am stärksten nach links orientierte, leichtfertig einen solchen Schritt wagen wird.

Es muß hinzugefügt werden, daß der Papst wohl eine Aufführung in Rom, jedoch nicht in anderen Städten verhindern kann. Seit dem Erscheinen der französischen Ausgabe dieses Buches fand eine Aufführung in Süditalien statt, jedoch nur eine, denn der Skandal war so groß, die Bevölkerung so verletzt, daß man von weiteren Aufführungen Abstand nahm.

auszuzögern. Im Falle Israels dürfte es sich aber wohl nur um eine Diskussion der Form halber, um eine künstlich entfachte Erörterung handeln, die einzig und allein zum Ziel hatte, eine gewisse Zurückhaltung zu bekunden, und geschähe dies auch nur zum Schein und aus Gründen der Diplomatie.

Ein Stück mit einem solchen Inhalt und einer solchen Form mußte zwangsläufig Wellen schlagen. Der Skandal begann zunächst mit einer Überraschung: Bis zum 20. Februar 1963 herrschte in der ganzen Welt, bei Atheisten und Gläubigen, bei den Anhängern der römisch-katholischen Kirche wie auch denen der anderen, mit dieser konkurrierenden christlichen Bekenntnisse, die fast einhellige Meinung, Papst Pius XII. habe alles getan, was in seiner Macht stand, um den Krieg zu verhindern oder doch in Grenzen zu halten. Als ihm schließlich beides nicht gelang, habe er sich mit ganzer Kraft dafür eingesetzt, zumindest eine Beendigung aller Grausamkeiten herbeizuführen, wann immer er davon Kenntnis erhielt. Bezüglich der Dinge, die man in diesem Zusammenhang den Deutschen zur Last legt — die der anderen werden nur noch selten erwähnt —, hatte von Ribbentrop am 27. März 1946 in Nürnberg folgendes erklärt: „... ich weiß, daß wir vom Vatikan Proteste erhielten, das heißt, wir hatten eine ganze Schublade voll von Protesten aus dem Vatikan⁵.“ Als man Ribbentrop vorwarf, niemals darauf geantwortet, ja nicht einmal Kenntnis davon genommen zu haben, hatte er präzisiert: „Das ist wirklich wahr. Es ist so: Der Führer nahm gegenüber diesen Vatikan-Angelegenheiten einen derartigen Standpunkt ein, daß von da an die Proteste mir nicht mehr übergeben wurden⁶.“ Es ging hierbei um Dinge, die sich im März 1943 in Polen zugetragen haben sollen. In Wirklichkeit hatten sich die Proteste aus dem Vatikan schon seit langem in Ribbentrops Schubladen angehäuft, ohne daß man ihnen auch nur irgendwelche Beachtung geschenkt hatte. Um den Standpunkt des Führers wie auch seine Rechtfertigungen kennenzulernen, braucht man ebenfalls nur die Protokolle des Nürnberger Prozesses zu stu-

⁵ *Der Prozeß gegen die Hauptkriegsverbrecher vor dem Internationalen Militärgerichtshof*, Amtlicher Text in deutscher Sprache, Bd. X, S. 162

⁶ Ebd., S. 163

dieren. Im Oktober 1939 hatte sich der Nuntius in Berlin, Msgr. Orsenigo, als er von der Behandlung polnischer Geistlicher durch die deutsche Polizei im besetzten Gebiet erfuhr, zu Staatssekretär von Weizsäcker begeben, um ihm zwei Protestnoten zu überreichen. Als von Steengracht, ein anderer Staatssekretär Ribbentrops, am 26. März 1946 in Nürnberg über den Verbleib dieser Noten verhört wurde, hatte er erklärt: „Der damalige Staatssekretär (von Weizsäcker) hat diese ordnungsgemäß Ribbentrop weitergeleitet, und Ribbentrop hat sie seinerseits Hitler vorgelegt. Da der Vatikan das Generalgouvernement nicht anerkannt hatte, und demgemäß der Nuntius für diese Gebiete nicht zuständig war, erklärte Hitler, als ihm diese Noten vorgelegt wurden: ‚Sie stellen eine einzige plumpe Lüge dar. Geben Sie diese Noten über den Staatssekretär in schroffer Weise dem Nuntius zurück und sagen Sie ihm, Sie würden niemals mehr eine derartige Sache entgegennehmen⁷.‘“

Dies läßt bereits folgende Schlüsse zu: Zweifellos hätten die durch den Nuntius in Berlin dem Auswärtigen Amt übergebenen Protestnoten auch keine größere Wirkung gehabt, wenn der Vatikan die von Hitler festgelegten Grenzen des neuen Polens anerkannt hätte. Doch anstatt sich den ganzen Krieg hindurch „schubladenweise“, ohne die geringste Registrierung, in Ribbentrops Schreibtisch anzuhäufen und anschließend in den Papierkorb zu wandern, von wo aus sie spurlos verschwanden, würden sie sich heute zumindest in den deutschen Archiven befinden, wo sie denen, die dort nach der Wahrheit forschen, zugänglich wären — falls sie nicht vielleicht doch sofort in einer Akte abgelegt wurden wie jene Nr. 6, die auf so geheimnisvolle Weise — und zum Glück für bestimmte Leute! — dann doch noch verschwand. Aber das ist eine andere Geschichte, auf die wir bei entsprechender Gelegenheit zurückkommen werden. An dieser Stelle sollte lediglich betont werden, daß Pius XII. durch seine Weigerung, das von Hitler umgestaltete Polen anzuerkennen, diesem das erforderliche Argument lieferte, um sich sämtlichen diesbezüglichen Vorstellungen des Papstes entziehen zu können. Diese Weigerung blieb im übri-

⁷ Ebd., S. 133

gen ohne jeden Einfluß auf seine Beurteilung durch die Nachwelt, da jener offensichtlich feindselige Akt gegenüber der Politik Hitlers ihm noch nicht einmal von seinen heutigen Kritikern zugute gehalten wird. Doch was hätte man ihm erst vorgeworfen, wenn er in dem Bemühen und in der Hoffnung, dadurch etwas zu erreichen, dieses neue Polen anerkannt hätte?

Steengracht gibt uns im übrigen auch Auskunft über die Art der Proteste des Vatikans sowie über den Personenkreis, der den Anlaß dazu bildete: „Ich habe ja gesagt, daß ich in Hunderten von Fällen, in denen der Nuntius zu mir kam, auch wenn es sich um Juden handelte, für die der Nuntius nicht zuständig war, und in Fällen, in denen der Nuntius tätig wurde für die polnischen Geistlichen, also auch ein Gebiet, für das er nicht zuständig war, die Fälle entgegengenommen habe . . .⁸.“

Es fällt auf, daß jedesmal, wenn in irgendeinem der dreizehn Nürnberger Prozesse die Sprache auf den Vatikan kam, die Zeugen der Anklage wie auch die der Verteidigung eine inhaltlich und weitgehend auch wörtlich gleiche Darstellung der Ereignisse gaben, in die sie seinerzeit verwickelt waren. Die Berichte zeigen keinerlei Abweichungen. Dies beweist, daß Pius XII. entgegen den Behauptungen seiner Verleumder keineswegs einzig und allein die Interessen der katholischen Kirche im Auge hatte und daß insbesondere die Juden nicht von seiner Fürsorge ausgeschlossen waren. Im übrigen ist meines Wissens diese Ansicht bis zum 20. Februar 1963 auch niemals von irgendeiner Seite öffentlich in Zweifel gezogen worden.

Es lassen sich aber noch bessere Zeugnisse anführen: Auf protestantischer Seite zeigte man sich im großen ganzen sehr zurückhaltend, obwohl die von Luther und Calvin überkommene anti-päpstliche Einstellung hier noch immer ihre Anhänger hat. Wir werden allerdings noch sehen, daß die Rolle, die die Protestanten bei der Machtergreifung Hitlers im Vorkriegsdeutschland spielten, sowie die Lage, in der sich der Protestantismus in der Nachkriegszeit befand, für diese Zurückhaltung nicht unmaßgeblich sind. Hingegen wurden die hervorragendsten Vertreter der jüdischen

⁸ Ebd., S. 159

Geisteswelt und Politik nicht müde, Pius XII. für sein Handeln während des Krieges Lob und Dankbarkeit zu bekunden. Denken wir an dieser Stelle gleichzeitig an die nicht nur zufriedenen, nein, begeisterten Kommentare, mit denen man in der gesamten Presse, einschließlich der sozialistisch und kommunistisch ausgerichteten Blätter, seine Wahl am 2. März 1939 begrüßt hatte, so rundet sich alles zu einem deutlichen Bild. Der Anhang zu diesem Buch enthält Darstellungen aller derjenigen, die uns Pius XII. während seiner ganzen Laufbahn als einen Papst gezeigt haben, der weder für den italienischen Faschismus noch für den deutschen Nationalsozialismus jemals auch nur die geringste Sympathie besaß. Dabei hat man im übrigen kaum bemerkt, daß sie für den russischen Bolschewismus auch nicht größer war.

Angesichts dieser ziemlich allgemein verbreiteten und festverwurzelten Ansicht bedeutet *Der Stellvertreter* von Rolf Hochhuth eine Wendung um einhundertachtzig Grad. Die daraufhin einsetzenden Reaktionen der Öffentlichkeit forderten den Autor gewissermaßen zu einer Rechtfertigung auf. Und dieser junge Mann, der die nicht zu unterschätzende Leistung vollbrachte, plötzlich, von einem Tag zum anderen, zum Mittelpunkt einer Welt zu werden, die sich auf der Suche nach einem guten Gewissen befindet, schilderte nun vor allem den entsetzlichen Gewissenskonflikt — den Alpdruck, wie Jacques Nobécourt es nannte⁹ —, der ihn vom Beginn seines fünfzehnten (Todesjahr Hitlers) bis zu seinem dreiunddreißigsten Lebensjahr begleitete und gegen den die seelische Zerrissenheit, die Victor Hugo uns in der Figur des Jean Valjean¹⁰ vor Augen führt, ganz sicher nur eine Kleinigkeit war. Dieser Gewissenskonflikt beruhte darauf, daß der Krieg für ihn ein ganz bestimmtes Gesicht trug — dieser Krieg, der fast sechs Jahre gedauert, die ganze Welt in Blut und Asche gelegt, der Europa von den Pyrenäen bis zur Wolga, vom äußersten Norden bis zum äußersten Süden in ein riesiges Trümmerfeld verwandelt und fünfzig Millionen Leichen auf der Strecke gelassen hatte: Unter diesen fünfzig Millionen Leichen, so sagte Hochhuth, gab es sechs

⁹ Nobécourt, *Le Vicaire* . . . , S. 71—76

¹⁰ Hauptfigur des Romans *Les Misérables* von Victor Hugo. (Anm. d. Übers.)

Millionen tote Juden — Männer, Frauen, Kinder und Greise, ohne jeden Unterschied —, und der Gedanke an diese sechs Millionen hatte ihn achtzehn Jahre lang Tag und Nacht gequält.

Wir wissen jetzt, nach welchen Gesichtspunkten Hochhuth vorgeht. So ist ihm der Krieg, der ihn weder in seinem Prinzip noch in seinen Gesamtauswirkungen jemals gekümmert hat, durch eine einzige seiner Folgeerscheinungen buchstäblich zu einer Qual geworden: durch das Unrecht, das er den Juden zufügte — alles übrige war belanglos! Und Hochhuth hatte nicht eher Rast noch Ruhe, bevor er nicht den Verantwortlichen für dieses Verbrechen gefunden hatte, das *weitaus schlimmer als das Schlimmste, weitaus schlimmer als alles überhaupt nur Vorstellbare*^{10a} war. Nach achtzehnjährigem, unbeschreiblichem Alptraum hatte er als guter Protestant, der wie alle seine Glaubensbrüder sämtliches Unglück dieser Welt auf die Existenz des Papstes zurückführt — ähnlich wie von einem nicht unbeträchtlichen Teil der öffentlichen Meinung jegliches Mißgeschick auf das Vorhandensein der Juden zurückgeführt wird —, den Schuldigen endlich gefunden, nämlich Pius XII. Wohl hatte dieser in jenen sechs Jahren jedesmal, wenn er das Wort ergriff, gegen jegliche Kriegsgreuel Protest erhoben — dies wurde auch von Hochhuth nicht in Abrede gestellt —, doch hatte er sich dabei stets einer ganz allgemeinen Sprache bedient, ohne jemals — mit einer einzigen Ausnahme — auf das Martyrium der Juden *expressis verbis* hinzuweisen. Dies führte zu der ersten Folgerung: daß der Papst geschwiegen habe. Die zweite Folgerung schloß sich daran an: Er habe geschwiegen — aus Sympathie für Hitler und den Nationalsozialismus! Und Hochhuth, der sich entsann, daß er Pius XII. in seinem Drama einen „Verbrecher“ genannt hatte, ging in dem Bemühen, die Unerschütterlichkeit dieser seiner Auffassung zu dokumentieren, sogar noch einen Schritt weiter, indem er hinzufügte, daß er „schändlich“^{10b} gewesen sei. Das Thema erhielt somit seine endgültige Gestalt: Wir erblicken einen Papst, der nicht nur zu einem „Verbrecher“, nein, zu einem „schändlichen Verbrecher“ wurde, und zwar einzig und allein des-

^{10a} Hochhuth, *Der Spiegel*, französische Ausgabe, v. 26. April 1963, und *Nouveau Candide* v. 19. Dezember 1963

^{10b} *Der Spiegel*, französische Ausgabe, v. 26. April 1963

halb, weil er schwieg! Wir werden im übrigen sehen, daß dieses Schweigen keineswegs den Tatsachen entsprach und ihm vor allem von solchen Leuten unterstellt wurde, die niemals wesentlich weiter sahen, als ihre Nase reichte.

Und die anderen Verantwortlichen? Die Churchill, Roosevelt, Stalin? Sowohl vor dem Kriege als auch während des ganzen Krieges waren ihnen alle nur denkbaren Möglichkeiten geboten worden, die Juden vor den Schrecknissen in Sicherheit zu bringen, diese Juden, welche die NS-Lenker Deutschlands (bevor sie sie in Lagern zusammenfaßten und danach) schon als bürgerliche Volksschicht für gefährlich hielten, erst redet aber als demoralisierendes Element für ihr im Kampf stehendes Volk ansahen. Aber sie haben es nicht getan — feine Leute, kann man da nur sagen! Jacques Nobécourt, der sehr treffend darauf aufmerksam machte, daß man eigene Schwächen nicht durch das Versagen anderer rechtfertigt, wies dieses Argument in sehr geschickter Weise zurück: „Das Beispiel dieser Leute heranzuziehen, um das Schweigen Pius' XII. zu erklären, hieße, den Papst mit Staatsmännern, die kraft ihres Amtes zu *Realismus* verpflichtet sind, auf eine Stufe stellen, während doch die Aufgabe des Papstes gerade darin bestand, ohne Rücksicht auf Opportunität *zu jeder Zeit* zu sprechen und die Botschaft des Evangeliums ins Gedächtnis zu rufen, indem er sie selbst genau befolgte¹¹.“ Nobécourt brauchte sodann nur noch zu demonstrieren, daß der päpstliche Auftrag, „ein Vater der gesamten Menschheit zu sein“, und zwar ohne Ansehen der Rasse, der Nationalität oder selbst der Religion, es Pius XII. zur Pflicht machte, „die Botschaft des Evangeliums, die in seine Hände gegeben war“, in diesem Sinne „ins Gedächtnis zu rufen“.

Das ist sicher, und Pius XII. bedurfte hier auch keiner Aufforderung. Die „genaue Befolgung“ der Botschaft des Evangeliums bestand für ihn in der Notwendigkeit, sich für die Rettung des Friedens — das heißt, für die Rettung der gesamten Menschheit — einzusetzen und später, nachdem er in diesem Bemühen gescheitert war, den Krieg zum Stillstand zu bringen, um zu retten, was zu retten war.

¹¹ Nobécourt, *Le Vicaire* . . . , S. 11

So gesehen, ist es gehässig, ihn eines angeblichen Schweigens zu beschuldigen, denn er erhob seine Stimme so laut und so deutlich, wie es ihm nur möglich war.

Doch nach der Meinung Nobécourts hätte die Pflicht zur „genauen Befolgung“ der Botschaft des Evangeliums den Papst veranlassen müssen, sein Handeln einzig und allein auf das Schicksal der Juden zu beschränken, mit anderen Worten: nichts gegen den Krieg zu unternehmen, ihn also seine Höllenfahrt fortsetzen zu lassen und ihm den Rest der Menschheit preiszugeben.

Man wird mir erlauben, daran zu zweifeln, daß die von Nobécourt unternommene Beweisführung sehr einleuchtend ist. Vor allem heutzutage. Denn wenn man schon so weit geht, Vermutungen darüber anzustellen, „was Papst Pius XII. erreicht hätte, wenn . . .“, dann zwingt wirklich nichts dazu, das nur der Gegenpartei zu erlauben. Man könnte ebenso behaupten, Pius XII. wäre auf der Skala der universellen Werte um einige Stufen herabgestiegen und hätte seinem päpstlichen Amt und Auftrag jene einseitige Auslegung gegeben, die er zum Mißfallen vieler von sich gewiesen hatte, wenn er nicht von einem Gipfelpunkt menschlichen Denkens ausgegangen und das Heil der Juden nur in unlösbarer Einheit mit dem Heil der ganzen Menschheit gesehen hätte, das heißt im Frieden, dem höchsten aller Güter. Hier hätte Nobécourt von *Realismus* sprechen können, diesmal allerdings von einem *Realismus* „niederer Art“, um so mehr, als dieser — genau wie jener, den er Pius XII. zum Vorwurf macht — ein bloßes Gedankengebilde bleiben mußte, denn es steht — wie wir noch zeigen werden und wie er auch selbst sagte — wohl eindeutig fest, daß Pius XII. im einen wie im anderen Falle angesichts der Ereignisse „vor Türen stand, die kein Schlüssel zu öffnen vermochte¹²“. Zudem könnte die große Mehrheit der übrigen Menschen darauf hinweisen, wie seltsam doch eine *Vaterschaft gegenüber der gesamten Menschheit* beschaffen gewesen wäre, deren Fürsorge vorzugsweise, wenn nicht gar ausschließlich, den Juden gegolten hätte, eine *Vaterschaft*, so kurzsichtig, daß sie, nachdem ihr das Wesen des Problems entgangen war, dasselbe gar nicht

¹² Ansprache an das Kardinalskollegium am 2. Juni 1943. (Zitiert nach Walter Adolph, *Verfälschte Geschichte, Antwort an Rolf Hochhuth*, Berlin 1963, S. 76 — Anm. d. Übers.)

mehr in seinem Kern angepackt hätte und die daher nicht nur für den Tod der Juden, sondern für alle fünfzig Millionen Menschenleben, die der Krieg forderte, verantwortlich gewesen wäre. Und es hätte nur noch allem die Krone aufgesetzt — doch niemandem würde das auffallen! —, wenn der Protestant Rolf Hochhuth unter dem gleichen frenetischen Beifall der Zionisten einen *Stellvertreter* über eben dieses Thema geschrieben, der Kommunist Piscator das Stück auf die Bühne gebracht hätte und der christliche Progressist Jacques Nobécourt ihnen in der gleichen Weise auf dem Fuße gefolgt wäre. Und — wenn man's recht überlegt — warum auch nicht?

Es ist möglich, daß es von höchstem Geiste zeugt, eine gewisse Verachtung für den *Realismus* zur Schau zu tragen und demgegenüber einen *Idealismus* zu bekunden, der darin besteht, *zu jeder Zeit*, ohne Rücksicht auf Opportunität, in einer einmal festgelegten Weise zu sprechen und zu handeln. Es kann schon sein, daß dies das Privileg und die Ehre der wahren Eliten darstellt — deren reinste Verkörperung sicherlich jener illustre Kreis war, der die Kampagne gegen Pius XII. startete. Jedenfalls steht die obenbeschriebene Haltung in jenen Kreisen, deren geistige Anmaßung nur noch ihrer Gewissenlosigkeit gleichkommt und an denen Pierre Daninos¹³ seine höchste Freude findet, in bestem Ansehen. Doch wenn man weiß, daß am Ende jeden Denkprozesses stets der Augenblick kommt, in dem die Folgerungen, die daraus gezogen werden, sich durch das Wort im Bereich des Sittlichen und durch die Tat im Bereich der tatsächlichen Verhältnisse niederschlagen müssen, das heißt der Augenblick, in dem im einen wie im anderen Falle das Ideale zum Realen werden muß, dann ist alles nicht mehr nur „Realismus“ oder nur „Idealismus“, und es geht, da sich das eine mit dem anderen vermischt, lediglich noch darum, zu wissen, auf welcher Ebene „zu jeder Zeit“ gesprochen oder gehandelt werden muß: auf der Ebene der „Beatles“, deren Ideal von der Notwendigkeit inspiriert zu sein scheint, auf die Alten pharisäerhaft hinabzusehen, oder auf der Ebene Christi, der den Kreuzestod erlitt, „um alle Sünden dieser Welt auf sich zu nehmen“, ob der Papst einzig und allein für das

¹³ *Snobissimo*

Heil der Juden eintreten mußte (immer vorausgesetzt, daß er wußte, in welchem Maße sie bedroht waren) oder für das der ganzen Menschheit? Die Antwort auf diese Frage wird, indem sie zwischen den beiden Extremen den Punkt festlegt, an dem alles nur noch „Realismus“ ist, und den, an dem alles „Idealismus“ ist, sagen, wo der Sophismus liegt.

Man kam sehr rasch dahinter, daß Hochhuth nach der Bewältigung seines „Alpträum“ nichts mehr zu sagen hatte — eines „Alpträum“, der, vergessen wir es nicht, achtzehn Jahre lang gedauert hatte, was sich in seinen Zügen deutlich spiegelte, in diesem Gesicht, „das in keiner Weise fesselte, diesem Gesicht eines Studenten, der gerade etwas Unpassendes gesagt haben könnte¹⁴“, was aber auch zu erkennen war an seinem vollen Haar, der faltenlosen Stirn und dem unbeteiligten Blick, an diesem ganzen Gesicht, dessen Harmonie durch nichts unterbrochen wurde, es sei denn durch den etwas zu sinnlichen Mund. Indem sie ihn ein kleines bißchen aufstachelten, brachten Journalisten es fertig, ihn zu Aussagen zu bewegen wie: er habe sich zu „einem Advokaten der katholischen Kirche“ gemacht, oder: in Berlin habe ein großer Teil der Zuschauer ihn „für einen Katholiken¹⁵“ gehalten. Der Wert dieser Aussage wurde einem sofort deutlich, wenn man hörte, daß er sich dabei auf solche hervorragende Persönlichkeiten wie „Hans Werner Richter und Günter Grass“ (!!!) berief. Oder er gab Dinge von sich wie: er greife den Papst weder als Menschen noch als Papst an, sondern deswegen, weil er „die Verkörperung der Schuld sei, die wir alle auf uns geladen haben“, und anhand dieser Gestalt müsse es „jedem Zuschauer möglich sein, über seine eigene Schuld nachzudenken¹⁶“. Nicole Zand gegenüber betonte er sogar, daß „der einzige Angriff gegen den Papst sich gegen dessen Schweigen richte, und zwar ausschließlich dagegen“, und daß „derjenige, der für fünfhundert Millionen Gläubige die Verantwortung trug ... und der von einer beträchtlichen Anzahl Ungläubiger als die höchste sittliche Instanz der Erde angesehen wurde, nicht das Recht hatte, still zu bleiben,

¹⁴ Guy Le Clec'h, *Figaro littéraire* v. 18. Dezember 1963

¹⁵ *Der Spiegel* v. 24. April 1963, S. 96

¹⁶ Nobécourt, *Le Vicaire* ..., S. 34

zu schweigen angesichts des Massenmordes, den die Nazis an den Juden verübten¹⁷“.

Und so wären wir wieder einmal beim Nebenaspekt angelangt, der aber als der wirkliche Kern der Sache angesehen wird, weil hier Pius XII. für eine der kriegführenden Mächte hätte Partei ergreifen können. Daß er das nicht tat, ist letzten Endes der ganze Vorwurf, den man gegen ihn erhebt. Dieser Sehweise begegnete Pius XII. jedoch schon im voraus, indem er seine Einstellung hinsichtlich der Kriegsoffer kundtat:

„... [dieser Krieg, der sich bereits in] einer Reihe von Handlungen [äußerte], die mit den Vorschriften des geltenden internationalen Rechts wie denen des Naturrechts und selbst mit den elementarsten Gefühlen der Menschlichkeit gleichermaßen unvereinbar sind: die Grausamkeiten und die unerlaubte Anwendung von Vernichtungsmitteln, selbst gegen Nichtkämpfer und Flüchtlinge, gegen Greise, Frauen und Kinder¹⁸.“

Oder hören wir von seiner Empörung bei dem Gedanken an die „Hunderttausende, die persönlich schuldlos bisweilen nur um ihrer Volkszugehörigkeit oder Abstammung willen dem Tode geweiht oder einer fortschreitenden Verelendung preisgegeben sind¹⁹“.

Oder denken wir an die Worte, mit denen er noch einmal eindringlich seinen Standpunkt klarzumachen versuchte, indem er hinwies auf die „Bitten derjenigen... , die sich mit angsterfülltem Herzen flehend an Uns wenden. Es sind dies diejenigen, die wegen ihrer Nationalität oder wegen ihrer Rasse von größerem Unheil und stechenderen und schwereren Schmerzen gequält werden und auch ohne eigene Schuld bisweilen Einschränkungen unterworfen sind, die ihre Ausrottung bedeuten²⁰.“

Diese absolut eindeutigen Stellungnahmen, die man in dieser oder jener Form fast immer antraf, sobald Pius XII. vor seinem üblichen Zuhörerkreis das Wort ergriff (insbesondere in allen

¹⁷ *Le Monde* v. 19. Dezember 1968

¹⁸ Weihnachtsbotschaft 1939

¹⁹ Weihnachtsbotschaft 1942. (Zitiert nach W. Adolph, *Verfälschte Geschichte*, S. 73 — Anm. d. Übers.)

²⁰ Ansprache an das Kardinalskollegium vom 2. Juni 1943. (Zitiert nach W. Adolph, *Verfälschte Geschichte*, S. 75 f. — Anm. d. Übers.)

seinen Weihnachtsansprachen und regelmäßigen feierlichen Ansprachen am 2. Juni jedes Jahres) oder sobald er sich schriftlich äußerte, werden von den Verteidigern des *Stellvertreter* im allgemeinen so wenig in Erwägung gezogen, als wären sie niemals ausgesprochen worden. Man kann nur fragen: Warum?

Die Antwort liegt uns vor in Form einer Erklärung des römischen Bankiers Angelo Donati gegenüber dem *Centre de Documentation juive contemporaine*, Paris²¹. Donati schildert darin den nachstehenden Meinungsaustausch zwischen dem Staatssekretär Pius' XII., Msgr. Maglione, und dem britischen Gesandten beim Heiligen Stuhl, Sir Osborne, von dem Donati im August 1943 durch Osborne Kenntnis erhielt:

„Sie sehen“, sagte Msgr. Maglione zu Sir Osborne, „daß der Heilige Vater [in seiner Weihnachtsbotschaft 1942] den Empfehlungen Ihrer Regierung getragen hat.“

Und Osborne entgegnete hierauf, „daß eine solche umfassende Verurteilung, die ebensogut das Bombardement der deutschen Städte gemeint haben könnte, nicht dem entspricht, was die englische Regierung erbeten hat“.

An dieser Stelle nun zeigt sich des Pudels Kern: Die Proteste Pius' XII. gegen die Greuel des Krieges waren stets so formuliert, daß sie ausnahmslos, ohne Rücksicht auf den Urheber, verurteilten. Was man dem Papst heute jedoch in dieser Hinsicht zum Vorwurf macht, ist, daß er sich nicht darauf einließ, nur die Schändlichkeiten des einen der beiden feindlichen Lager anzuprangern. Mit dieser Einstellung bekennt Pius XII. sich seinerseits

²¹ Dokument CCXVIII-78 des *Centre de Documentation juive contemporaine*. Hochhuth, der dieses Schriftstück in seinem historischen Anhang (*Der Stellvertreter*, S. 259 f.) zitiert, erwähnt hierzu folgendes: „Im Herbst 1942 hat Donati dem Papst durch Vermittlung des Ordensgenerals der Kapuziner eine Note über die Situation der Juden in Südfrankreich überreichen lassen und um päpstliche Hilfe gebeten. Sie blieb völlig aus.“ Aus dem Telegramm Nr. 232 vom 14. September 1942 des deutschen Botschafters beim Heiligen Stuhl, von Bergen, erfahren wir hingegen: „Der vom Heiligen Stuhl bei der französischen Regierung unternommene Schritt zwecks Milderung der Maßnahmen gegen die Juden ist bisher ohne Ergebnis geblieben. Im Vatikan ist man nach wie vor durch die dort eingehenden Nachrichten sehr beeindruckt.“ (Zitiert nach Saul Friedländer, *Pius XII. und das Dritte Reich*, S. 84 f.) Die Anklage Hochhuths schreckte offenbar vor nichts zurück!

zu der allerdings noch sehr neuen Lehre von Papsttum und Kirche, die, von Pius X. konzipiert, bei Benedikt XV. ihre glänzendste Formulierung fand:

„Wir bedauern es, daß Wir nicht mehr tun können, um das Ende dieser Heimsuchung [gemeint ist der Erste Weltkrieg] herbeizuführen. Unser apostolisches Amt gestattet es Uns nicht. Hingegen gehört es zweifellos in höchstem Maße zu den Obliegenheiten des Pontifex Maximus, der von Gott zum obersten Interpreten und Schützer des ewigen Rechtes bestellt wurde, zu verkünden, daß es keinem Menschen, aus welchen Gründen auch immer, gestattet ist, das Recht zu verletzen. Wir verurteilen jegliches Unrecht, von welcher Seite es auch begangen sein mag. Aber es wäre weder angemessen noch nützlich, in den eigentlichen Streit der Kriegführenden einzugreifen²².“

Die Worte „angemessen . . . , nützlich . . . “ klingen zweifellos ein wenig nach ganz gewöhnlichem „Realismus“, doch nur, wenn man sie aus ihrem Zusammenhang löst und wenn man vergißt, daß ein Papst ebenfalls den Rang und die Vorrechte eines Staatsoberhauptes besitzt und als solches genötigt ist, sich in der Öffentlichkeit der Sprache der Diplomatie zu bedienen, falls er seine „apostolische“ Mission nicht gefährden will.

Als der Journalist, demgegenüber die obige Äußerung gemacht wurde, dem Papst im Verlauf des Gesprächs zu bedenken gab, daß „zahlreiche Priester in Belgien und Frankreich als Geiseln festgenommen und erschossen“ worden seien, entgegnete Benedikt XV., daß auch von der Gegenseite Geiseln genommen und erschossen worden seien, und zwar nicht nur Geistliche:

„Mir ist von österreichischen Bischöfen versichert worden“, sagte er, „daß auch die russische Armee katholische Geistliche als Geiseln festgenommen und, bei einer anderen Gelegenheit, fünfzehnhundert Juden vor sich hergetrieben habe, um hinter dieser lebenden Schutzmauer, die den feindlichen Kugeln preisgegeben war, vorzurücken. Der Bischof von Cremona teilt mir mit, daß die

²² Die Äußerung erfolgte vor dem Konsistorium am 22. Januar 1915. Sie wurde gegenüber dem Journalisten Louis Latapie anlässlich eines Interviews wiederholt und von der Zeitung *La Liberté* in der Ausgabe vom 22. Juni 1915 abgedruckt.

italienische Armee bereits achtzehn österreichische Geistliche als Geiseln festhalte²³.“

Man vermeint, das Telegramm vor Augen zu haben, das Harold Tittmann, Hauptmitarbeiter des Sonderbeauftragten Präsident Roosevelts beim Heiligen Stuhl, Myron Taylor, am 5. Januar 1943 an das *State Department* sandte, nachdem er sich bei Pius XII. nach der wahren Bedeutung der Weihnachtsbotschaft des Jahres 1942 erkundigt hatte:

„Was die Weihnachtsbotschaft anbelangt“, schrieb der amerikanische Diplomat, „so machte der Papst mir den Eindruck, daß er aufrichtig glaubt, er habe sich klar genug geäußert, um alle, die im Vergangenen darauf bestanden, er solle einige Worte zur Verurteilung der nationalsozialistischen Grausamkeiten sagen, zufriedenzustellen. Er schien überrascht, als ich ihm sagte, nicht alle Leute seien derselben Ansicht.

Er sagte mir, seines Erachtens sei es für alle Welt klar, daß er die Polen, die Juden und die Geiseln meinte, als er von Hunderttausenden von Menschen sprach, die man getötet oder gefoltert habe, ohne ihnen irgendwelche Schuld beimessen zu können, ja manchmal nur auf Grund ihrer Rasse oder ihrer Nationalität.

Er sagte mir, er habe, als er von diesen Grausamkeiten sprach, nicht die Nationalsozialisten nennen können, ohne die Bolschewisten ebenfalls zu nennen, das aber hätte seiner Meinung nach den Alliierten wahrscheinlich nicht gefallen.

Er erklärte, er fürchte, die Berichte der Alliierten über die Grausamkeiten seien fundiert, obgleich er mir zu verstehen gab, daß seiner Ansicht nach ein wenig Übertreibung zu Propagandazwecken im Spiele sei. Im großen und ganzen meinte er, seine Botschaft müsse vom amerikanischen Volk gut aufgenommen werden, und ich sagte ihm, ich stimmte mit ihm überein²⁴.“

Angesichts dieser eindeutigen Darstellung und Billigung seitens eines amerikanischen Diplomaten — dessen Zeugnis wohl ebensoviel Gewicht haben dürfte wie das der deutschen Diplomaten, die

²³ Ebd.

²⁴ *Foreign Relations of the United States* 1943 II, S. 911 ff. (Zitiert nach Friedländer, *Pius XII.*, S. 97 — Anm. d. Übers.)

²⁵ In seinem bereits angeführten Werk *Pius XII. und das Dritte Reich*

Saul Friedländer²⁵ zitiert, um den Beweis zu erbringen, daß nur Hitler alle Taten und Aussprüche des Papstes „gut aufnehmen“ konnte — hätte das Verhalten Pius' XII. eigentlich niemals Anlaß zu Diskussionen geben dürfen. Dies gilt auch für seine Einstellung gegenüber den Opfern, hinsichtlich derer er stets erklärt hatte, seine Bemühungen gälten „in gleicher Sorge allen Kriegsopfern, allen materiell oder seelisch unter der Kriegsnot Leidenden ... in Deutschland ... wie in der übrigen Welt ... auf der einen oder anderen Seite ... gleichviel, ob die Betroffenen Kinder der Kirche oder Außenstehende sind²⁶“. Eine solche Haltung stellte den einzigen Weg dar, nicht „in den Streit der Kriegführenden einzugreifen“, nicht Partei zu ergreifen für die eine und gegen die andere Seite — das heißt, einen Weg, der den Forderungen aller sittlichen Lehren, ob auf religiöser Grundlage oder nicht, entsprach. Sie war gleichzeitig die einzige Möglichkeit innerhalb der Grenzen, die ihm durch das päpstliche Amt vorgezeichnet waren, „das Ende der Heimsuchung“ — dieses „gegenseitigen Morgens“, an das zu denken ihm „unerträglich“ war, wie er in seinem Schreiben an Bischof von Preysing sagte — „herbeizuführen“. Aus dem Bemühen des Papstes um die Beendigung des Krieges und aus seiner Sorge um eine ganz bestimmte Gruppe der Kriegsoffer konstruierten seine Ankläger anhand des im *Stellvertreter* dargestellten Themas eine Alternative, bei der die Wahl schon von vornherein feststehen sollte: als eine Entscheidung für eben diesen Kreis von Opfern. Mit der Weigerung, seiner Fürsorge eine so einseitige Ausrichtung zu geben, erbrachte Pius XII. den Beweis, daß zwischen ihm und seinen Anklägern lediglich ein Unterschied im Grad der Einsicht bestand. Im übrigen hatte seine Intervention im obengewünschten Sinne bei zwei Gelegenheiten, 1939 in Polen und 1942 in Holland²⁷, das Los der Betroffenen nur noch härter gemacht und ihre Zahl

²⁶ Schreiben an Msgr. von Preysing, Bischof von Berlin. (Zitiert nach Adolph, *Verfälschte Geschichte*, S. 40 und 42 — Anm. d. Übers.)

²⁷ Im Dezember 1939 baten die polnischen Geistlichen sowohl der von den Deutschen als auch der von den Russen besetzten Gebietsteile den Papst inständig darum, die Sendungen von Radio Vatikan einzustellen, da diese einzig und allein zur Folge hätten, ihr Los zu verschlimmern. Im Juni 1942 hatte ein für den Gebrauch der Gläubigen frei vervielfältigtes päpstliches Dokument zum gleichen Ergebnis für die Juden und Halbjuden in Holland geführt.

vergrößert; es war klar, daß er damit gleichzeitig auch seine späteren Möglichkeiten für die Wiederherstellung des Friedens aufs Spiel gesetzt hatte.

Wir übergehen schweigend die Art und Weise, in der Rolf Hochhuth von „unser aller Schuld“ spricht und den Papst als den „Vertreter“ dieser allgemeinen Schuld bezeichnet. Es ist eine wohl-bekannte psychologische Erscheinung, daß ein Schuldiger zunächst einmal dadurch reagiert, daß er ausruft, er sei nicht der einzige Schuldige, und um sich herum nur noch Menschen sieht, die genauso schuldig sind wie er. Nicht weniger bekannt ist es, daß die erste Sorge mehrerer Schuldiger, sobald sie unter sich sind, darin besteht, außerhalb ihres Kreises den Verantwortlichen für ihr gemeinsames Versagen zu suchen. Es ist eine immer wiederkehrende Tatsache, daß sich dieser Verantwortliche stets findet: Man nennt ihn, nach der Fabel, den „Sündenbock“. Hinsichtlich der Hitler-Zeit trägt Rolf Hochhuth, damals ein kleines Kind, noch kaum aus den Windeln heraus, und ein wenig später ein halbwüchsiger Junge, ganz offensichtlich keinerlei Verantwortung. Nichtsdestoweniger legt er eine Reaktion an den Tag, die ebenfalls zu jenem Register althergebrachter und durchaus bekannter Phänomene gehört: So sah er sich in dem Alter, in dem man geistig zu erwachen beginnt, in aller Unbefangenheit ganz unvermittelt mit der Verantwortlichkeit seiner nächsten Mitmenschen konfrontiert — beispielsweise der seines Vaters und der seiner älteren protestantischen Glaubensgenossen. Da ihre Rolle bei der Machtergreifung Hitlers in Deutschland nicht unbedeutend war, mußte — so folgte er — für den Krieg und alle seine Folgen das gleiche gelten. Es bestand kein Zweifel: Obwohl unschuldig, gehörte er doch zu einer Sippe von Schuldigen. Dieser Gedanke wurde ihm unerträglich. Die Ehre der Sippe: Noch immer ist es Rodrigue²⁸,

²⁸ Im folgenden wird ein Vergleich zu Pierre Corneilles klassischer Tragödie *Le Cid* (1636) angestellt.

Im Verlauf einer Auseinandersetzung versetzt *Don Gomez, Comte de Gormas*, dem greisen *Don Diègue* eine Ohrfeige. *Don Rodrigue*, Titelheld des Dramas und Sohn Don Diègues, symbolisiert Tapferkeit, Treue, Ehre, Pflicht gegenüber seiner Familie: Die seinem Vater angetane Schmach ist auch die seine. Um seines Vaters und gleichzeitig seine eigene Ehre wiederherzustellen, fordert er den Beleidiger Gormas zum Zweikampf und tötet ihn. (Anm. d. Übers.)

der sich durch die Ohrfeige, die sein Vater empfing, am stärksten gedemütigt fühlt, noch immer setzt Don Diègue sein Vertrauen auf ihn. Im vorliegenden Falle hatte Rodrigue alias Hochhuth viele Väter. Und für alle jene Protestanten, die das schlechte Gewissen drückte, war der Papst die Ohrfeige, der Affront — dieser Papst mit dem ruhigen Gewissen, dieser Papst, dessen Ruf durch sein Verhalten vor dem Krieg und während des Krieges nicht im geringsten beeinträchtigt worden war. Die Niederlage Luthers. Vertauschte Rollen: das Recht auf seiten Don Gormas'. Rodrigue hatte zwar sehr viele Väter, im übrigen aber sehr wenig Mut: Um den Degen zu ziehen, wartete er vorsichtigerweise, bis Don Gormas tot war.

Doch genug des Vergleichs.

Daß es Hochhuth mit seiner Formulierung „unser aller Schuld“ vorläufig gelungen ist, die Schuld seiner eigenen Sippe auszuklammern, sie aufzulösen, zu ertränken in jener sogenannten allgemeinen Schuld und seiner Partei ein gutes Gewissen wiederzugeben, steht ebenso außer Zweifel wie seine persönliche naive Unschuld — ein Ausdruck, der hier übrigens in seinem doppelten Sinne zu verstehen ist, vorzugsweise jedoch in seiner abwertenden Bedeutung. Dennoch hat man den Eindruck, daß er vor allem das Ausmaß seines ungehörlichen Verhaltens abschwächen wollte, was man noch als positiv angesehen hätte, wäre es nicht zugleich die niedrigste Art, sich selbst zu rechtfertigen. Denn, so darf man sich fragen, gibt es eine gemeinere und unter Umständen verabscheuungswürdigere geistige Manipulation als zum Beispiel jene, daß der Politiker oder sein geistiger Lehrmeister, der Industriekapitän, einen Teil der Verantwortung für einen Krieg oder einen Friedensvertrag auf den kleinen Monteur in den Renault-Werken abwälzt? Wenn wir „alle schuldig sind“ im Hinblick auf den Tod der Juden, warum sollten wir dann nicht auch alle schuld sein am Kriege?

Womit hat ein einziger unter uns es verdient, an den Pranger gestellt zu werden? Warum verdienen nur einige wenige Strafe, und das auch noch in härterem Maße? Warum gehört Hochhuth zu denjenigen, die am hartnäckigsten fordern, daß nur diese wenigen, in Frankfurt oder anderswo, bestraft werden? Es stellte ein-

mal jemand die Behauptung auf: „Wir sind alle Mörder!“ Hiermit wurde das gleiche Thema angeschlagen, jedoch in der Absicht, zu beweisen, daß es keinem unter uns ansteht, sich zum Richter aufzuwerfen. Ohne über den Wert dieses Ausspruches urteilen zu wollen, muß man zugeben, daß der, der diesen Satz aufstellte, immerhin ein ganz anderes geistiges Format besaß.

Von den Erklärungen und Rechtfertigungen Rolf Hochhuths, die des Festhaltens wert wären, bleibt nur noch der Ausspruch übrig, mit dem er sich als „ein Advokat der katholischen Kirche“ hinstellt. Wir werden nicht näher darauf eingehen: Auch das Lächerliche hat seine Daseinsberechtigung, man darf sie ihm nicht verwehren.

II. DAS RECHT AUF DICHTERISCHE FREIHEIT

Die Anhänger Hochhuths haben ganz offensichtlich versucht, sich der Debatte über den Kern des Problems zu entziehen. Zunächst einmal wäre zu sagen, daß keiner von ihnen die Argumente, die ihnen entgegengehalten wurden, je für falsch erklärte. Da sie die Beweise nicht in Abrede stellen konnten, akzeptierten sie diese Argumente als wahr, bezeichneten sie jedoch als unzureichend. Und für das Thema des nur allzu berühmten Gerstein-Berichtes, auf dem ihr Favorit seine Anklage aufgebaut hatte, begnügten sie sich mit der Versicherung, dies alles sei ja allgemein bekannt. Sodann flüchteten sie sich in Binsenwahrheiten über die Tradition des Theaters, die schon immer — angefangen von den griechischen Tragikern, auf dem Wege über Shakespeare, Corneille, Racine, Molière, Schiller, Victor Hugo und andere, bis hin zu Paul Claudel — darin bestanden habe, der Geschichte Persönlichkeiten zu entnehmen und sie auf die Bühne zu bringen. Hierbei brachten sie als Argument vor, daß *Der Stellvertreter* von Rolf Hochhuth lediglich deshalb Anstoß erzeuge, weil der Autor es sich erlaubt habe, einen Papst auf der Bühne zu zeigen, das heißt eine Persönlichkeit, die von zu vielen Menschen als hochheilig und unantastbar angesehen werde. Und, so argumentierten sie weiter, es gäbe schließlich keine wesentlichen Gründe, mit Pius XII. eine Ausnahme zu machen, die man weder Sokrates, Julius Cäsar, Richard

III., Heinrich VIII., Cromwell, Johanna von Orléans noch selbst Alexander VI. Borgia, der ebenfalls Papst war, eingeräumt habe.

Einverstanden. Wir wollen sogar noch hinzufügen, daß die Dramatiker, die jene berühmten Persönlichkeiten auf die Bühne brachten, sich gegenüber der Geschichte ebensoviele Freiheiten herausnahmen wie Rolf Hochhuth und daß ihnen das trotzdem niemals jemand verübelte. Hierfür gibt es wenigstens zwei Gründe: Der eine liegt darin, daß sie uns — selbst im Falle des recht bedenkenlosen Aristophanes, der das politische Theater erfand, und selbst noch im Falle des plumpen Claudel — Meisterwerke des Geistes, der Kultur und der Kunst präsentierten, während sich bisher niemand fand, der zu behaupten gewagt hätte, daß *Der Stellvertreter* in dieser dreifachen Hinsicht etwas anderes als ein trauriges Erzeugnis sei. Der zweite Grund ist der, daß sie redliche Leute waren und den Ausgaben aller ihrer Werke eine Bemerkung voranschickten, in der sie ihre Quellen anführten und gleichzeitig deutliche Angaben darüber machten, welche Freiheiten sie sich aus Gründen der Inszenierung, ihrer Phantasie oder ihrer Überzeugungen gegenüber der Geschichte erlaubt hatten. Eben zu dem Zweck, den Autoren diese Freiheiten zu gestatten, die niemanden, weder in den Tatsachen noch in den Absichten, täuschen, schuf das Theater sich dann ja auch jene fiktiven Gestalten, die Zofen und anderen männlichen und weiblichen Vertrauten, die man unter der Bezeichnung „Nebenrollen“ findet. Hochhuth hingegen hat die Ausgabe seines *Stellvertreter* mit einem „historischen Anhang“ versehen und erklärt dazu, daß es „wenig üblich ... [sei], ein Drama ... [damit] zu belasten²⁹“, woraus ersichtlich wird, inwieweit er sich in dem, was auf diesem Gebiet üblich ist, auskennt. Er bemerkt weiter, der Anhang solle „beweisen, daß der Verfasser des Dramas sich die freie Entfaltung der Phantasie nur so weit erlaubt hat, als es nötig war, um das vorliegende historische Rohmaterial überhaupt zu einem Bühnenstück gestalten zu können²⁹“, und er habe sich „nur an beweisbare Tatsachen³⁰“ gehalten. Doch beim Lesen dieses Anhangs stellt man fest, daß außer den Sophismen,

²⁹ Hochhuth, *Stellvertreter*, S. 229

³⁰ Ebd., S. 259

mit Hilfe deren er die Schuld Pius, XII. zu beweisen sucht, hinsichtlich derjenigen Tatsachen, gegen die der letztere sich hätte verwahren müssen, nur Zeugnisse aus zweiter oder dritter Hand darbietet, wobei in den meisten Fällen präzise Angaben fehlen oder, wenn ein Hinweis erfolgt, er in einer Form gegeben wird wie „einen Industriellen, dessen Name mir leider entfallen ist ...“³¹, „wenn ich nicht irre“³¹, „möglich ist es auch“³² etc. Überdies bringen alle diese Zeugnisse keine *Beweise*, sondern lediglich eine *Überzeugung*, die übrigens bei allen die gleiche ist und die in ihrer Quintessenz folgendermaßen aussieht: „Der SS-Offizier Kurt Gerstein, der mir diese Dinge erzählt hat“ oder „der diese Dinge meinem Nachbarn erzählte, der sie dann mir weitererzählte, kann nicht gelogen haben.“ Es sind gewissermaßen „Beweise aus innerer Gewißheit“. Und was für welche! Sie gestatten es Hochhuth, zu erklären: „1942, als er in der Nuntiatur erschien und hinausgeworfen wurde“³³, und dann zu unterstellen: „Gersteins Mut und Geschicklichkeit, die sein jahrelanges, nahezu selbstmörderisches Doppelspiel in der SS überhaupt ermöglicht haben, sprechen dafür [sic], daß er bei seinem Versuch, dem Nuntius Einzelheiten aus Treblinka zu berichten, auch bis zu Orsenigo selbst vorgedrungen ist. Die Gewalt seines Anliegens und Gersteins listige Entschlossenheit machen es unwahrscheinlich, daß er sich von einem subalternen Priester aus der Nuntiatur hinausweisen ließ“³⁴.

Dies heißt Erwin Piscator, der Regisseur des *Stellvertreter*, „wissenschaftlich erarbeitetes Material künstlerisch formuliert ausbreiten“³⁵, dies nennt Jacques Nobécourt „eine ständige Bezugnahme auf die Geschichte“³⁶. Besten Dank für solche Kunst, besten Dank für solche Wissenschaft, besten Dank für solche Geschichte!

³¹ Ebd., S. 232

³² Ebd., S. 233

³³ Ebd., S. 16

³⁴ Ebd., S. 232

³⁵ Ebd., S. 9

³⁶ Nobécourt, *Le Vicaire* . . . , S. 10

III. PORTRÄT DES SS-OFFIZIERS KURT GERSTEIN

Wenn man bedenkt, daß nach der Darstellung Hochhuths das ganze Problem darin besteht, zu wissen, ob es dem SS-Obersturmführer Kurt Gerstein gelang oder nicht gelang, im August 1942 dem Vatikan Informationen über die Vorgänge zu übermitteln, die sich in Belzec und Treblinka — und nicht, wie Nobécourt und Hochhuth vorgeben, im Konzentrationslager Auschwitz — abgespielt haben sollen, dann ist es immerhin wichtig, über diesen SS-Offizier Kurt Gerstein so genau wie möglich unterrichtet zu werden. Es soll ein von ihm unterzeichnetes Dokument vorhanden sein, in dem es heißt, er sei „zum Verlassen der Botschaft seiner Heiligkeit aufgefordert“ worden und er „habe dann alles dies Hunderten von Persönlichkeiten berichtet, u. a. dem Syndikus des katholischen Bischofs von Berlin, Herrn Dr. Winter, mit der ausdrücklichen Bitte um Weitergabe an den päpstlichen Stuhl³⁷“. Hieraus folgert Saul Friedländer, ein weiterer Generalstaatsanwalt im Fall Pius XII.: „Es besteht kein Grund zu der Annahme, daß der Text nicht nach Rom geschickt worden ist.“ Und er fügt hinzu, selbst wenn das nicht geschehen sei, „darf man vermuten [sic], daß Ende 1942 dem Papst ein mit dem hier zitierten im wesentlichen übereinstimmender Text durch Bischof von Preysing übersandt worden ist³⁸“. Dies ist eine weitere Methode, geschichtliche Wahrheit „wissenschaftlich zu erarbeiten“. Und der Mann, der so vorgeht, ist Geschichtsprofessor am *Institut universitaire des Hautes Études internationales* in Genf! Nicht einen Augenblick lang kommt es ihm in den Sinn — im Gegensatz zu denen, die noch ein wenig Urteilsvermögen haben und die sich die Mühe machten, das mit „Gerstein“ unterzeichnete Schriftstück zu lesen —, daß, wenn Gerstein Dr. Winter wirklich das berichtete, was in dem besagten Dokument niedergelegt ist, dieser ihn nur für einen Irren halten konnte³⁹.

Wie dem auch sei, die „wissenschaftlich erarbeitete“ Wahrheit,

³⁷ Augenzeugenbericht zu den Massenvergasungen, *Vierteljahrshefte für Zeitgeschichte* 1. Jg. (1953), S. 192 f. (Deutsche Fassung des Gerstein-Berichts)

³⁸ Friedländer, *Pius XII.*, S. 93

³⁹ Vgl. P. Rassinier, *Das Drama der Juden Europas*, S. 110 ff.

zu der sich Hochhuth schließlich bekennt und die er auf die Bühne bringt, ist folgende: Im August 1942 weist der päpstliche Nuntius in Berlin den SS-Offizier Kurt Gerstein ab, jedoch nachdem er ihn zuvor angehört hat. Ein junger Jesuit aus der Nuntiatur schenkt am folgenden Tage seinen Berichten Glauben und überbringt am 2. Februar 1943 die von ihm erhaltenen Informationen dem Vatikan. Zwecks größerer Sicherheit folgt ihm Gerstein dorthin, es gelingt ihm, sich Gehör zu verschaffen usw. Das Weitere läßt sich erraten: Alles wird dem Papst bekannt, und der Papst — schweigt!

Für die in dem Stück verfochtene These ist es nämlich von Bedeutung, daß der Papst von den Vorkommnissen wußte, und zwar bis ins kleinste. Es ist nicht ersichtlich, warum, denn die Frage, ob er *bis ins kleinste* davon wußte oder nicht, hätte angesichts der Auffassung, die er von seinem päpstlichen Auftrag hatte, an seinem Verhalten ohnehin nichts geändert. Denn, man kann es nicht oft genug wiederholen, diese Auffassung, die einzige, die in bezug auf sämtliche Sittenlehren akzeptierbar ist, bestand ja gerade darin, seine Handlungsweise nicht von dieser oder jener Gruppe von Opfern, von dieser oder jener Todesart, die sie erlitten, abhängig zu machen, sondern in seinem Handeln dem Krieg als solchem sowie den Möglichkeiten seiner Beendigung Rechnung zu tragen. Übrigens bestand seine Waffe im einen wie im anderen Fall lediglich in der diplomatischen Intervention, obgleich Nobécourt dies wohl für Pius X.⁴⁰, aber nicht für Pius XII. gelten läßt. Auf alle Fälle hat er von dieser Möglichkeit diplomatischer Intervention jedesmal Gebrauch gemacht, wenn er von irgendwelchen Dingen Kenntnis erhielt, ganz gleich, ob es sich hierbei um die Verfolgung der Juden oder um die Luftangriffe handelte. Das einzige, was man ihm vorwerfen könnte, ist, daß er dieser Intervention niemals eine Form gab, die eine Parteinahme zugunsten der einen oder anderen Seite der Kriegführenden bedeutet hätte. Aber gerade das gereicht ihm zur Ehre, denn wäre ein solches Verhalten für ein beliebiges Staatsoberhaupt auch durchaus berechtigt gewesen, für den Stellvertreter Christi war es das nicht. Ob er etwas wußte oder nicht, ist daher nur hinsichtlich der geschichtlichen Wahrheit von Interesse. Nun, er wußte nicht von den Dingen, die gewußt zu haben man ihm vorwirft, und Kardinal Tisserant⁴¹, den man ver-

geblich gegen Pius XII. auszuspielen suchte und den man auf Grund seiner Meinungsverschiedenheiten mit ihm⁴² nicht verdächtigen kann, hat die Frage endgültig entschieden:

„Über Auschwitz“, erklärte der Kardinal, „wurden wir erst nach der Ankunft der Alliierten in Deutschland unterrichtet“⁴³.

Diese Wahrheit, die man, wenn man ein Gefühl für Anstand hat, nicht gegen die eines Hochhuth, noch selbst eines Piscator, eines Jacques Nobécourt oder eines Saul Friedländer aufwiegen kann, macht es unerlässlich darzulegen, was es mit jenem SS-Offizier Kurt Gerstein und dem von ihm unterzeichneten Dokument genau gesehen auf sich hat.

Der SS-Mann Kurt Gerstein ist für mich ein alter Bekannter. Aus Sorge um Europa, das ohne Deutschland nicht denkbar ist, bin ich bemüht zu verhindern, daß die geschichtliche Wahrheit über die Konzentrationslager in den wilden Wogen des Deutschenhasses hinweggespült wird. Das Zeugnis jenes Geistlichen, dem es gelungen war, ganz Frankreich und sogar die Journalisten der ganzen Welt davon zu überzeugen, daß er Tausende und aber tausende von Menschen die Gaskammern in Buchenwald und Dora⁴⁴ betreten sah (wo es, wie ich selbst wußte, gar keine gab), hatte mich deshalb ebenso erregt wie am 31. Januar 1946 das mit „Gerstein“

⁴⁰ Nobécourt, *Le Vicaire* . . . , S. 120

⁴¹ In seinem Schreiben vom 11. Juni 1940 teilt er dem Erzbischof von Paris, Kardinal Suhard, mit, daß er „seit Anfang Dezember 1939“ den Heiligen Vater nachdrücklich darum gebeten habe, „eine Enzyklika über die Pflicht des einzelnen, der Stimme des Gewissens zu folgen, zu veröffentlichen“. Pius XII. lehnte ab. Nichts ist natürlicher als das, denn am 20. Oktober 1939, das heißt kaum mehr als einen Monat vorher, hatte er die Inauguralenzyklika seines Pontifikats veröffentlicht, in der dieses Thema angesprochen wurde. Das Schreiben Kardinal Tisserants wurde am 26. März 1964 von der gesamten Presse groß herausgestellt.

⁴² Nobécourt, *Le Monde* v. 26. März 1964

⁴³ *Le Nouveau Candide* v. 2. April 1964. Der Kardinal fügte hinzu, er selbst habe während seines Versuchs, Pius XII. von der Notwendigkeit einer Enzyklika über „die Stimme des Gewissens“ zu überzeugen, „keineswegs an die Juden oder an den Nationalsozialismus, sondern an den Islam gedacht“. Dies durchkreuzte alle daran geknüpften Erwartungen und machte es unmöglich, sein Schreiben an Kardinal Suhard gegen „das Schweigen“ Pius' XII. zu wenden. Schach und matt! Doch die Verteidiger des *Stellvertreter* taten, als ob nichts gewesen wäre.

⁴⁴ Siehe P. Rassinier, *Die Lüge des Odysseus*, S. 153 f.

unterzeichnete Dokument. In diesem stand, daß man in den Konzentrationslagern des besetzten Polens die Juden in Schüben von 750 bis 800 Personen in Gaskammern mit einer Grundfläche von 20 qm (eine Fassung des Dokuments — es existieren nämlich zwei davon — spricht von 25 qm) und einer Höhe von 1,90 m systematisch erstickte. Wie es in dem Dokument weiter hieß, seien insgesamt 25 Millionen europäische Juden auf diese Weise erstickt worden. Auschwitz war lediglich zitiert; im Gegensatz zu Belzec und Treblinka war der SS-Offizier in diesem Lager *nicht Augenzeuge*, sondern hatte anhand von Rechnungen über Zyklon B, das er selbst dorthin geliefert hatte, entsprechende *Folgerungen gezogen*. Mit Verlaub gesagt, ich habe sogleich gedacht, daß ein Mann, der solche Ungeheuerlichkeiten zu äußern vermochte, entweder gar nicht existierte oder nur ein Irrer⁴⁵ sein konnte, daß diejenigen, die diese Dinge ernst nahmen, einen Fall für den Psychiater darstellten und daß diese Dinge selbst der Ausdruck einer bis ins Äußerste getriebenen Deutschfeindlichkeit waren. Da man ihnen jedoch trotz allem Glauben schenkte, wird man verstehen, daß ich mir einmal Klarheit verschaffen wollte. Ich gebe im folgenden einen kurzen Überblick über das, was ich in dieser Hinsicht ermittelt und an anderer Stelle in einem ausführlichen Bericht dargelegt habe, auf den ich den Leser, dem es um die reine Wahrheit geht, hinweisen möchte⁴⁶:

1. Der Gerstein-Bericht liegt in zwei Fassungen vor, einer deutschen vom 4. Mai 1945 und einer französischen vom 26. April 1945 (was zur Genüge beweist, daß Pius XII. nicht im Jahre 1942

⁴⁵ Wenn der SS-Offizier Kurt Gerstein dies dem Syndikus des katholischen Bischofs von Berlin, Herrn Dr. Winter, wirklich berichtet hat (s. o. S. 42), dann kann man nur allzu gut verstehen, daß dieser es niemals an den apostolischen Nuntius in Berlin und dieser wiederum es nicht an den Papst weitergab! Und wenn es sich um die gleichen Dinge handelt, die der Mitarbeiter des Sonderbeauftragten Präsident Roosevelts am Vatikan, Tittmann, Ende Dezember 1942 dem Papst mitteilte, dann ist es ebenso verständlich, daß dieser ihm zur Antwort gab, „er fürchte, die Berichte der Alliierten über die Grausamkeiten seien fundiert“, wenn auch „seiner Ansicht nach ein wenig Übertreibung zu Propagandazwecken im Spiele sei“. (Vollständig zitierter Text des Telegramms s. o. S. 35.) Es muß dabei sogar betont werden, daß Pius XII. sich in seiner Ausdrucksweise sehr maßvoll zeigte.

⁴⁶ Rassinier, *Drama der Juden* und *La Voix de la Paix*, Juni 1964

— oder Anfang des Jahres 1943, wie im *Stellvertreter* gesagt wird — davon Kenntnis gehabt haben konnte). Diese beiden Fassungen gehen zwar von den gleichen Tatsachen aus, doch decken sie sich weder in ihrer äußeren Form noch in ihrem Text.

2. Weder die eine noch die andere Fassung wurde jemals irgend einem Gerichtshof vollständig vorgelegt oder in irgendeiner Form offiziell veröffentlicht. Eine davon wurde am 30. Januar 1946 im Prozeß gegen die Hauptkriegsverbrecher in Nürnberg zitiert, jedoch ohne daß man erfuhr, um welche der beiden es sich handelte, und ohne daß eine weitere Angabe ihres Inhalts erfolgte. Da sie dem Gerichtshof, obwohl dieser im übrigen darauf drang⁴⁷, nicht vorgelegt wurden, bedeutete das, daß keine der beiden Fassungen als Beweismittel der Anklage zugelassen wurde. Aus Gründen der Redlichkeit muß präzisiert werden, daß Bruchstücke davon, deren Echtheit unmöglich nachzuprüfen ist, von anderen Gerichten in anderen Prozessen — insbesondere dem Prozeß, den man im Januar 1948 gegen die Herstellerfirma des Zyklon B anstrebte, sowie dem „Ärzteprozeß“^{47a} im Januar 1947 — zugelassen wurden „mit der Begründung, daß dieses Dokument im Hauptkriegsverbrecherprozeß zugelassen gewesen sei“, was keinesfalls zutrifft, und „daß man die Entscheidungen dieses Prozesses statutgemäß nicht in Frage stellen könnte“^{47a}. Mit derselben juristischen Begründung schließlich wurde das Dokument in seiner französischen Fassung auch 1961 beim Eichmann-Prozeß in Jerusalem zugelassen.

3. Der Gerstein-Bericht ist heute aus dem *Dépôt central d'archives de la justice militaire française* (Zentralarchiv des französischen Militärgerichtshofes) sowie „aus den Akten der Spruchkammer in Tübingen“⁴⁸, die im Jahre 1949 in dieser Sache zu entscheiden hatte, verschwunden. Ein ungemein günstiger Umstand, denn der

⁴⁷ Der Prozeß gegen die Hauptkriegsverbrecher vor dem Internationalen Militärgerichtshof (Nürnberg 1948) VI, S. 370 f. und 400 f. Als der französische Ankläger Dubost in der Verhandlung am Morgen des 30. Januar 1946 das Dokument vorlegte, lehnte der Vorsitzende es als Beweisunterlage glatt ab. Während der Verhandlung am Nachmittag weigerte sich dann Dubost, es vorzulegen!

^{47a} Rückübersetzung (Anm. d. Übers.)

⁴⁸ Léon Poliakov, *L'Arche*, 1. Januar 1964, und *La Terre retrouvée*, 1. April 1964

Skandal um den *Stellvertreter* war mittlerweile so weit gediehen, daß die Veröffentlichung dieses Dokumentes notwendig und nahezu unvermeidlich wurde, wenn man in dieser Angelegenheit Einheitlichkeit erreichen wollte: Es erhebt sich die Frage: Wer hatte ein Interesse daran, es verschwinden zu lassen? Es fällt auf, daß hier zum zweiten Mal in dem Streit um Pius XII. ein Dokument verlorengegangen ist: Bekanntlich ist die Akte Nr. 6 des Vatikans in den deutschen Archiven ebenfalls unauffindbar; dabei war es *nicht nur ein einzelnes* Schriftstück, sondern *ein ganzes Bündel!* Es wird heutzutage in den Archiven leicht gestohlen. Doch es hat nicht den Anschein, als kümmerte das die für die Bewahrung der Archivbestände verantwortlichen Stellen sehr: Es erfolgte nicht die geringste Nachforschung. Das Verschwinden der Vatikan-Akte Nr. 6 aus den deutschen Archiven ist sicherlich schwerwiegend, doch bis zu einem gewissen Grade wiedergutzumachen. Man verfügt schließlich immer noch über die Bestände der Engländer und Amerikaner, die, wie zu hoffen steht, nicht der Plünderung anheimgefallen sind wie die der Franzosen und Deutschen und die zweifellos alle notwendigen Nachprüfungen ermöglichen werden. Es verbleiben außerdem die Archive des Vatikans, doch unterliegen ihre Bestände einer einhundertjährigen Sperrfrist, wobei eventuelle Verzögerungen noch gar nicht eingerechnet sind. Gegenwärtig sind sie bis zum Jahre 1849 freigegeben. Diese Regelung bezieht sich, wohlgemerkt, auf die politischen Schriftstücke und nicht auf die *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, die in lateinischer Sprache vernünftigerweise laufend veröffentlicht werden. Ich glaube behaupten zu können, daß man auf Grund der durch den *Stellvertreter* hervorgerufenen Polemiken für die Zeit des Nationalsozialismus eine Ausnahme machen wird, ja, daß man sogar schon daran arbeitet⁴⁹, daß aber die Besteigung des Thrones Petri durch denjenigen, den man schon heute „den guten Papst Johannes XXIII.“ nennt, weder dazu angetan war, die Dinge zu erleichtern, noch sie zu beschleunigen.

⁴⁹ Diese Bemerkung wurde geschrieben, bevor der Vatikan offiziell diese Absicht bekanntgab. Nunmehr ist in Rom der erste Band der diplomatischen Akten des Vatikans erschienen. Darin wird die These der hier vorliegenden Arbeit bestätigt.

Es gibt ferner noch die russischen Archive. Doch da man die Gepflogenheiten der Russen auf dem Gebiet der Geschichte kennt, darf man darauf nicht allzusehr zählen, in der nächsten Zeit zumindest nicht.

Das Verschwinden des Gerstein-Berichtes, um darauf zurückzukommen, ist weitaus schwerwiegender: Dieses Schriftstück wurde niemals zum Gegenstand irgendeines diplomatischen Schrittes, und wenn das Original seiner in zwei Sprachen⁵⁰ abgefaßten Angaben verschwunden ist, gibt es weiter keine Spur mehr. Folglich wird es niemals mehr möglich sein, die Echtheit dieses Dokumentes nachzuprüfen. Zwar verbleibt noch eine der beiden Versionen, nämlich die deutsche Fassung, die von dem deutschen Historiker Rothfels veröffentlicht wurde, doch wird diese Fassung, die auf Grund ihrer in den Fußnoten offen zugegebenen Änderungen gegenüber dem Original bereits sehr verdächtig ist, bei Nichtwiederfinden des Originals nichts weiter als eine Fiktion sein. Es bleibt ferner die französische Fassung, die vor dem Tribunal von Jerusalem⁵¹ der Öffentlichkeit bekannt wurde, doch wenn das Original verschwunden ist, bedeutet das, daß diese Fassung nicht vom Original genommen wurde und daß sie trotz des Beweiswertes, der ihr seitens des Gerichtshofes von Jerusalem beigemessen wurde, keinerlei historischen Wert besitzt: Die Hexenprozesse des Mittelalters sind voll von Zeugnissen dieser Art. Darüber hinaus sind da auch noch die Unterschiede gegenüber der von Rothfels publizierten deutschen Fassung.

4. Ein weiterer Punkt bleibt Kurt Gerstein selbst. Als er am 30. Januar 1946 vor dem Gerichtshof in Nürnberg erstmalig erwähnt wurde, war er bereits tot. Sein Todesdatum wird als bekannt angegeben, und zwar mit dem 25. Juli 1945. Doch weiß man weder, wo er starb, noch, was aus seinem Leichnam wurde⁵². Demzufolge wird dieses Datum selbst zweifelhaft. Nachstehend

⁵⁰ Ja sogar in drei Sprachen, da dem Anschein nach ein oder zwei angefügte Blätter auf englisch abgefaßt waren.

⁵¹ Attendu (Urteilsbegründung) 124 im Eichmann-Prozeß (nach Poliakov, *Le Procès de Jérusalem*, S. 224 f.)

⁵² Mitteilung der *Commission Oecuménique pour l'Aide Spirituelle aux Prisonniers de Guerre*, Genf, vom 10. März 1949 (nach Rothfels, *Vierteljahreshefte* 1. Jg. [1953], S. 185)

einige Angaben zu den Umständen, unter denen sein Tod erfolgte: Nach seiner Verhaftung durch einmarschierende französische Truppen in Rottweil soll er dem amerikanischen Geheimdienst übergeben und von ihm verhört worden sein. Danach soll er dem französischen Geheimdienst übergeben und von diesem zwecks weiterer Verhöre in ein Pariser Militärgefängnis gebracht worden sein. In welches, weiß man allerdings nicht, denn die Unterlage, auf die man sich stützt, besagt lediglich: „Prison Militaire de Paris⁵³“. Es ist seltsam und überrascht, daß nicht gesagt wird, in welches. In jenem unbekannten Militärgefängnis⁵⁴ soll man ihn eines Morgens erhängt vorgefunden haben. Danach nichts mehr: Nacht und Nebel. Wir befinden uns in einer Zeit, in der Dokumente, Menschen, ja sogar Leichen auf geheimnisvolle Weise verschwinden, und bald wird sich leichter rekonstruieren lassen, was zwanzig Jahrhunderte vor Christi Geburt bei den Eskimos oder den Hottentotten geschah, als das, was sich vergangene Woche in Paris zutrug. Was wurde aus dem SS-Offizier Kurt Gerstein nach dem 4. Mai 1945? Es ist nichts darüber bekannt, doch ist es nicht ausgeschlossen, daß es noch gelingen könnte, etwas darüber zu erfahren. Vielleicht würde es genügen, die beiden amerikanischen Offiziere, die ihn verhörten und deren Namen und Anschriften man kennt, als Zeugen vorzuladen. Ich betone, vielleicht! Denn es läßt sich immerhin ein Fall denken, bei dem diese Offiziere sich auf bloße Bestätigungen beschränken würden: der Fall nämlich, in dem der SS-Offizier Kurt Gerstein die Aussagen in dem Bericht, der seine Unterschrift trägt — falls es sich überhaupt um die seine handelt! —, nur unter Zwang, im Verlauf oder am Ende eines Verhöres vom Typ der „sanften Vernehmungen“, gemacht hätte und ihnen in Rottweil selbst ganz schlicht und einfach unter den Händen weggestorben wäre. In diesem Falle wäre die Überführung in jenes unbekannte Pariser Militärgefängnis eine reine Erfindung gewesen, einzig und

⁵³ Ebd., S. 185

⁵⁴ Poliakov erklärt, im „Cherche-Midi“, doch gibt er seine Quellen nicht an. Poliakov ist bekannt für seine Manie, Texte zu präzisieren oder zu verbessern (vgl. seine erste Version des Gerstein-Berichtes in *Le Bréviaire de la haine*, S. 224 f.)

allein zu dem Zweck, das Verbrechen zu verschleiern, und das wäre auch der Grund, weshalb man den Namen jenes Gefängnisses nicht kennt.

In allen übrigen denkbaren Fällen werden sie aussagen. Von dem Punkt ausgehend, an dem sie Gerstein nach dem Verhör zurückließen, wird es möglich sein, Schritt für Schritt den Weg bis zu seinem Tode zu rekonstruieren, die Umstände zu ermitteln, unter denen sein Tod erfolgte, vielleicht sogar seinen Leichnam aufzufinden. Zugleich wird man dann auch wissen, wie es sich mit der Echtheit des ihm zugeschriebenen Berichtes verhält.

Bisher hat man sich wohl gehütet, jene beiden Offiziere zu befragen. Wenn man sich auch jetzt, nachdem der Bericht verschwunden ist, nicht dazu entschließt, dann bedeutet das, daß er niemals existiert hat.

Und trotz aller Fähigkeit Hochhuths und seiner Anhänger, die geschichtlichen Wahrheiten „wissenschaftlich zu erarbeiten“, hat dann *Der Stellvertreter* kein Fundament mehr.

Infolgedessen wird auch verständlich, daß sie stets auswichen, sobald irgend jemand versuchte, sie an dieses Gebiet, nämlich die Geschichte selbst, heranzuführen.

IV. DIE KRONZEUGEN

In einer anderen Hinsicht jedoch zeigten die Anhänger Hochhuths große Ausführlichkeit, die bis an die Grenzen des Schicklichen ging, nämlich bei den Kronzeugen. Hier wurde man wirklich sehr verwöhnt, denn man begegnete Persönlichkeiten wie Albert Camus, François Mauriac, Albert Schweitzer, Thomas Mann und anderen.

Auf einer Konferenz am 28. November 1945 bei den Dominikanern hatte Albert Camus bezüglich Pius' XII. erklärt:

„Eine Stimme hätte ich in jenen schrecklichen Jahren gern gehört. Man sagt mir, sie habe gesprochen. Ich stelle jedoch fest, daß ihre Worte nicht bis zu mir gedungen sind⁵⁵.“

Der Nobelpreisträger Albert Camus — eine Persönlichkeit also,

⁵⁵ Zitiert nach *L'Express* v. 19. Dezember 1963, S. 27

vor der man vor Ehrfurcht in den Boden versinkt. Dennoch sei hier in aller Bescheidenheit darauf aufmerksam gemacht, daß nicht allzuviel übrigbliebe, müßte man alles das aus der Geschichte streichen, was Albert Camus nicht vor die Augen oder zu Ohren kam. So genommen, würde er selbst von einer recht beachtlichen Anzahl von Leuten aus der Geschichte gestrichen werden. Er war zweifelsohne ein sehr großer Philosoph, doch stellte er das mit derartigen Aussprüchen ganz gewiß nicht sonderlich unter Beweis.

Nicht weniger Ehrfurcht empfindet man vor dem überaus großen Schriftsteller und Nobelpreisträger François Mauriac, der im Geleitwort zu einem Buch Léon Poliakovs⁵⁶ folgendes schrieb:

„Wir hatten jedoch nicht den Trost, den Nachfolger des Galiläers Simon Petrus mit eindeutigem und klarem Wort, und nicht mit diplomatischen Anspielungen die Kreuzigung dieser unzähligen ‚Brüder des Herrn‘ verurteilen zu hören. In der Zeit der Besetzung drang ich eines Tages in den verehrungswürdigen Kardinal Suhard, der im stillen so viel für die Verfolgten getan hatte: ‚Eminenz, weisen Sie uns, für die Juden zu beten . . . ‘, und er hob statt jeder Antwort die Arme zum Himmel. Gewiß hatte die Besatzungsmacht Druckmittel, denen man nicht widerstehen konnte, und das Schweigen des Papstes und der Hierarchie war nichts anderes als entsetzliche Pflicht; es ging darum, schlimmeres Übel zu verhüten. Es bleibt, daß ein Verbrechen von solcher Weise zu einem nicht geringen Teil auf alle Zeugen zurückfällt, die geschwiegen haben, was immer die Gründe ihres Schweigens gewesen sein mögen.“

Alexis Curvers hat in sehr geistreicher Weise die Abenteuer geschildert⁵⁷, die dieser Text zu bestehen hatte. Hochhuth hatte daraus zunächst nur den ersten Satz zitiert. Die dadurch entstandene Verfälschung des Sinnes war offensichtlich. Nachdem die Verleger von Pater Marlé⁵⁸, der die Sinnentstellung als erster bemerkte, auf frischer Tat ertappt worden waren, gaben sie schließlich in mehreren Auflagen den gesamten Text an. Ich bin jedoch

⁵⁶ *Le Bréviaire de la haine*, (Text zitiert nach Hochhuth, *Stellvertreter*, S. 6 — Anm. d. Übers.)

⁵⁷ *Le Pape outragé*

⁵⁸ *Figaro littéraire* v. 19. Dezember 1963

im Besitz eines Exemplars einer deutschen Ausgabe, in der der Verleger die Korrektur nur auf Kosten einer Änderung des Umbruchs hätte vornehmen können und demzufolge sämtliche Mottos, das heißt zwei Druckformen, ganz einfach ausließ, so daß das Vorwort Erwin Piscators mitten in einem Absatz beginnt. Demgegenüber umfaßt die amerikanische Ausgabe, die den vollständigen Text François Mauriac wiedergibt, zusätzlich noch einen Brief von Albert Schweitzer: Zum Ruhme Hochhuths fehlte wirklich nur noch dieser!

Um mit François Mauriac zu Ende zu kommen, sei im folgenden aufgezeigt, wie Alexis Curvers seine „Zeugenaussage“ beurteilt:

„Zum großen Glück für Mauriac ordnete der Kardinal nicht die von diesem geforderten öffentlichen Gebete an; indessen gab er einen Protest heraus, was Mauriac nicht tat; er handelte ‚im stillen‘, was Mauriac nicht hindert, ihn im gleichen Atemzuge als verehrungswürdig und für das Verbrechen verantwortlich zu bezeichnen.

Trotz der Druckmittel der Besatzungsmacht, denen man sich nicht widersetzen konnte, trotz der entsetzlichen Pflicht des Schweigens und trotz des schlimmeren Übels, das es zu verhüten galt, forderte Mauriac von Papst, Hierarchie und allen Zeugen einen Protestschrei, den er selbst nicht im entferntesten ausstieß, aber der zwanzig Jahre später zu einem geradezu mit Besessenheit vorgetragenen Thema, zu *dem* Leitsatz im Feldzug gegen Pius XII. wurde, diesem Feldzug, der in jenen vier Sätzen Mauriacs bereits vollständig enthalten ist.“

Man könnte es nicht besser ausdrücken. Es muß jedoch hinzugefügt werden, daß François Mauriac zur Zeit der Ereignisse sich weitaus mehr Gedanken darum machte, was in Vichy gesprochen wurde und welche Dispositionen Oberleutnant Heller von der deutschen Propaganda-Staffel für ihn traf, als darum, was im Vatikan gesagt wurde. Hier offenbart sich eine Eigenschaft des „nahezu zeitlosen Klanges“⁵⁹ einer Stimme: Sie überdeckt alle anderen.

⁵⁹ *Le Figaro* v. 3. Juli 1940. Es handelt sich um die Stimme Marschall Pétains.

Aus dem Brief, den Albert Schweitzer am 30. Juni 1963 aus Lambarene an den deutschen Verleger Rolf Hochhuths richtete, sollen nur die drei wesentlichen Gedanken herausgegriffen werden:

1. „Ich habe das Versagen, das damals (in der Zeit der Judenverfolgung) stattfand, lebhaft miterlebt und finde, daß wir uns mit diesem großen Problem des Ablaufs der Geschichte beschäftigen müssen.“

Wir erfahren hier, daß Albert Schweitzer diese Zeit „lebhaft miterlebt“ hat, also ein aktiver Zeuge war. Gegen wen? Gegen Hitler selbstverständlich. Zwanzig Jahre später ist das immer nützlich zu wissen.

2. „Versagt hat ja nicht nur die katholische Kirche, sondern auch die protestantische. Die katholische hat die größere Schuld, weil sie eine organisierte, internationale GröÙe war, die etwas unternehmen konnte, während die protestantische eine unorganisierte, machtlose nationale GröÙe war.“

Albert Schweitzer ist Protestant, und daß er für seine Kirche spricht, setzt niemanden in Erstaunen. Er sei jedoch darauf hingewiesen, daß die protestantische Kirche in Deutschland mit 40 bis 45 Millionen Mitgliedern eine weitaus größere Macht darstellte als die katholische Kirche mit 20 bis 25 Millionen und daß sich ihre Geistlichen 1933 nicht besonders hervortaten, als es darum ging, Hitler an der Machtergreifung zu hindern, eher im Gegenteil, während der katholische Episkopat gegen ihn stimmen ließ⁶⁰.

3. „Es hat ... eine Bedeutung, daß das Drama ‚Der Stellvertreter‘ erschien. Es ist nicht nur die Verurteilung einer geschichtlichen Persönlichkeit, die die große Verantwortung des Verschweigens auf sich lud, sondern es ist auch eine ernste Mahnung an unsere Kultur, der Duldung der Humanitätslosigkeit, mit der wir es nicht ernst nehmen, entsagen zu wollen.“

Ein historisches Urteil? Die Vorstellung, daß die Geschichte Urteile fällt, ist in den heutigen traurigen Zeiten sicherlich ziemlich verbreitet. Nicht weniger sicher ist es, daß das Urteil, das in diesen Worten von Albert Schweitzer gefällt wird und das sich nicht scheut, einen Rolf Hochhuth mit der Geschichte zu identifizieren,

⁶⁰ S. u. S. 173 ff.

noch nicht einmal mittelmäßig genannt werden kann. Der gemeinsame Tenor dieser drei Gedanken kann niemandem mehr entgehen: Der erste Punkt stellt mit dem Hinweis auf ihn selbst als aktiven Zeugen eine Werbung in eigener Sache dar. Der zweite ist eine Werbung für seine Kirche, die zweifellos „auch versagt“ hat, jedoch in weit geringerem Maße als die katholische Kirche, und die man außerdem in vielerlei Hinsicht entschuldigen kann. Der dritte schließlich ist eine diskrete Erinnerung an sein Werk in Lambarene, das er mittels einer sehr geschickten Werbung in hervorragender Weise dahingehend zu nutzen wußte, daß er persönlich in den Augen einer geistig zerrütteten Welt als Inbegriff der Humanität erschien, ein Werk jedoch, das einer beachtlichen Anzahl redlich denkender Menschen⁶¹ mehr und mehr fast ausschließlich kommerziell ausgerichtet zu sein scheint.

Es genügt im übrigen, *Les Mots*⁶² zu lesen, jenes Meisterwerk Jean-Paul Sartres, der in weiblicher Linie von den Schweitzers abstammt und sie daher gut kennt: Nach der Lektüre dieses Werkes hegt man keine Zweifel mehr daran, daß dieser Sinn für Reklame, der von Morvan Lebesque in einer Reportage⁶³ aus Lambarene bestätigt wurde, in der Familie Schweitzer erblich ist.

Bei Thomas Mann liegt der Fall ein wenig anders. Dieser deutsche Schriftsteller, der im Jahre 1901 (im Alter von 26 Jahren) durch einen bemerkenswerten gesellschaftskritischen Roman, *Die Buddenbrooks*, berühmt wurde, hatte 1914 die Aufmerksamkeit der intellektuellen Kreise Frankreichs wegen des Einflusses auf sich gezogen, den er in den intellektuellen Kreisen Deutschlands zugunsten des Ersten Weltkrieges ausgeübt hatte⁶⁴. Man muß annehmen, daß der Krieg ihm ein Bedürfnis war: Von 1933 an stellte er sich in den Dienst des Zweiten Weltkrieges. Seine philosophischen Beweggründe jedoch hatten in einem Vierteljahrhundert eine völlige Wandlung erfahren, denn von einem Anhänger des Pangermanismus war er zu einem Gegner des Nationalsozialismus ge-

⁶¹ G. McKnight, *Le D^r Schweitzer*

⁶² (Die deutsche Ausgabe erschien bei Rowohlt unter dem Titel *Die Wörter*. — Anm. d. Übers.)

⁶³ *Canard enchaîné* v. 7. Oktober 1964

⁶⁴ Vgl. Stefan Zweig, *Die Welt von gestern*

worden. Die Niederwerfung des Nationalsozialismus allerdings hatte er vorsichtshalber uns überlassen: Er selbst hatte nämlich bei den ersten Anzeichen der Gefahr, die dieser für ihn bedeutete, nichts Eiligeres zu tun gehabt, als schleunigst seine kostbare Person in den Vereinigten Staaten in Sicherheit zu bringen. Kurz gesagt — ein sehr großer Schriftsteller (auch er ist Nobelpreisträger), aber ein ganz gewöhnlicher Feigling! Im Gegensatz zu seinen Mitwürdenträgern von der Schwedischen Akademie, die sich darauf beschränkten, nachträglich allgemeine Redensarten über die Entsetzlichkeit von Dingen von sich zu geben, von denen sie nicht die geringste Ahnung hatten, äußerte er sich zu den Ereignissen, während sie sich abspielten, und zwar aus der vollen Kenntnis der Tatbestände heraus, für die er sich verbürgte: Denn — dort drüben war er dem Geschehen in Europa nur um so näher und sein allerunmittelbarster Zeuge. Aus diesem Grunde war er in der Lage, uns während der acht Minuten Sendezeit, die ihm monatlich bei Radio BBC zur Verfügung standen, mit überaus großer Genauigkeit über die kleinsten Vorkommnisse in Polen zu unterrichten, und daher war er auch der erste, der im November 1941 auf die dortigen Massenmorde an Juden und Polen und später, im Januar 1942, auf die Vergasung holländischer Juden hinwies⁶⁵.

Es ist nicht bekannt, woher Thomas Mann seine Informationen erhielt. Möglicherweise verfügte er über dieselben Quellen wie ein gewisser Ralf Feigelson, von dem wir eine Übersicht besitzen, in der sämtliche Nachrichten aus Polen datenmäßig aufgeführt sind:

„Mit Beginn der ersten Massenmorde in Osteuropa hatten der

⁶⁵ Um es dem Leser zu ermöglichen, die Zuverlässigkeit dieser Meldungen, die von Hochhuth mit entschieden unübertroffener Fähigkeit, die geschichtlichen Wahrheiten „wissenschaftlich zu erarbeiten“, aufgegriffen werden (vgl. *Der Stellvertreter*, Historische Streiflichter, S. 246 f.), in der richtigen Weise einzuschätzen, wollen wir unsererseits darauf hinweisen, daß der jüdische Ankläger in Nürnberg Robert Kempner den ersten für Polen bestimmten Transport von Juden auf den 28. März 1942 datiert (*Eichmann und Komplizen*, Europa Verlag, Stuttgart, S. 185) und daß Joseph Billig vom Centre de Documentation juive contemporaine in Paris hierfür den 27. nennt (*La Condition des Juifs en France, Revue d'Histoire de la Deuxième Guerre mondiale*, Oktober 1956). Es sei noch hinzugefügt, daß der Beschluß zur Deportation der Juden in den Osten auf der berühmten Konferenz in Berlin-Wannsee am 20. Januar 1942 gefaßt wurde.

jüdische und polnische Widerstand die Weltöffentlichkeit alarmiert. Ende 1941 wurde London durch die Widerstandsbewegung von Lodz über die Vorkommnisse in Chelmno unterrichtet. Am 16. März, 31. August und 15. November 1942 wurden drei Berichte aus Warschau abgesandt. Im April 1943 stieß das Getto von Bialystock einen SOS-Ruf aus. Diese Notschreie, die nicht ungehört bleiben⁶⁶ ...“

Meines Wissens wurde niemals auch nur die geringste Spur einer für London bestimmten Information über die Geschehnisse in Chelmno „Ende 1941“ aufgefunden, auf Grund deren man behaupten könnte, daß London ihr Bedeutung beigemessen habe. Es ist hingegen möglich, daß ein am 8. August 1942 vom Vertreter des Jüdischen Weltkongresses in Genf, Riegner, an die Botschaft der Vereinigten Staaten in Bern gerichtetes Schreiben⁶⁷ auf dem Bericht aus Warschau vom 16. März fußt. Es erhebt sich jetzt lediglich die Frage, wann der Vatikan informiert wurde und wie er reagierte. Mit Sicherheit läßt sich sagen, daß ihm erstmalig am 26. September 1942 durch ein Schreiben des Sonderbeauftragten Präsident Roosevelts beim Heiligen Stuhl, Myron Taylor, an Staatssekretär Msgr. Maglione⁶⁸ genaue Fakten zur Kenntnis gebracht wurden. Das Schreiben behandelt die Liquidierung des Warschauer Gettos, „Massenexekutionen“ in Belzec, Massaker, Deportationen nach Litauen, Lublin oder Theresienstadt, und zwar in Transporten von je vierzig Personen pro Waggon usw. Wohl wird darin gesagt, daß die „Leichen zur Fettherstellung und die Knochen zur Düngerherstellung verwendet“ werden, doch Gaskammern werden nicht erwähnt. Die Informationen seien am 30. August 1942 seitens des Genfer Büros der Jewish Agency for Palestine übermittelt worden, das angibt, sie „von zwei durchaus glaubwürdigen Augenzeugen (Ariern), von denen der eine am 14. August aus Polen eintraf“, erhalten zu haben. Jedoch wird keiner der beiden Zeugen namentlich angeführt.

⁶⁶ *Le Monde* v. 21. Januar 1964

⁶⁷ Friedländer, *Pius XII.*, S. 86

⁶⁸ Ebd., S. 89 f.

Ferner in *U.S. Department of State Bulletin*, Bd. VII (Washington 1942)
Friedländer, a. a. O., S. 90 — Anm. d. Übers.)

Die Antwort Msgr. Magliones erfolgte am 10. Oktober 1942. Nach Aussage des Hauptmitarbeiters Myron Taylors, Tittmann, hatte sie folgenden Inhalt:

„Nachdem die Note [Msgr. Magliones] Botschafter Taylor dafür gedankt hat, daß er den Heiligen Stuhl auf die Frage aufmerksam machte, erklärt sie, daß ebenfalls Berichte aus anderer Quelle über harte Maßnahmen gegen Nichtarier zum Heiligen Stuhl gelangt sind, daß es aber bis zum gegenwärtigen Augenblick nicht möglich war, diese auf ihre Genauigkeit hin zu überprüfen⁶⁹ . . .“

Wie verständlich ist es doch, daß seitens des Heiligen Stuhles das Bedürfnis bestand, die Zuverlässigkeit dieser Informationen zu überprüfen! Und wie verständlich ist es auch, daß Pius XII. am 30. Dezember 1942 in einer Unterredung mit dem obengenannten Harold Tittmann die Äußerung von sich gab, „er fürchte, die Berichte der Alliierten über die Grausamkeiten seien fundiert“, wenn auch „seiner Ansicht nach ein wenig Übertreibung zu Propagandazwecken im Spiele sei“!

Zu diesem Zeitpunkt war bereits die gemeinsame Erklärung der Alliierten vom 18. Dezember 1942 veröffentlicht worden, in der sie zum Schicksal der nach Osten deportierten Juden Europas Stellung nahmen. In der Erklärung ist die Rede davon, daß man dabei sei, „die oft wiederholte Absicht Hitlers zu verwirklichen, die jüdische Bevölkerung in Europa auszurotten“, daß der Abtransport der Juden „unter abstoßend grauenhaften und brutalen Bedingungen“ erfolge, daß „die Arbeitsfähigen in Arbeitslagern langsam zu Tode geschunden“, „die Schwachen dem Kälte- und Hungertod ausgesetzt“ würden und daß „die Zahl der Opfer . . . auf viele Hunderttausende . . . geschätzt⁷⁰“ werde, doch Gaskammern werden auch in diesem Falle nicht erwähnt. Da Pius XII. durch Myron Taylor bekannt war, aus welch zweifelhaften Quellen die Informationen stammten, auf die in der Erklärung Bezug genom-

⁶⁹ Ebd., S. 91

⁷⁰ Friedländer, *Pius XII.*, S. 91 f.

Ferner in *U. S. Department of State Bulletin*, Bd. VII (Washington 1942) S. 1009 (Zitiert nach Friedländer, a. a. O., S. 92 — Anm. d. Übers.)

⁷¹ Vgl. oben S. 56 f.

men wurde⁷¹, mußte er zwangsläufig das Bedürfnis verspüren, sie hinsichtlich ihrer Zuverlässigkeit zu überprüfen.

Was Thomas Mann von Januar 1942 an über die Vergasungen berichtet hatte, war völlig unbeachtet geblieben. Wie es scheint, kann das erste Mal, bei dem diese Dinge so zur Sprache gebracht wurden, daß man ihnen seitens der Regierungen und diplomatischen Kreise der Alliierten Glaubwürdigkeit beimaß, auf November 1943 datiert werden. Zu diesem Zeitpunkt nämlich erschien in London das Buch eines jüdischen Professors der Rechtswissenschaft der Universität Warschau, der 1939 dorthin geflüchtet war, das Werk *Axis Rule in Occupied Europe* von Rafael Lemkin. Freilich wurde das Buch nur mit großem Vorbehalt aufgenommen, denn man muß zugeben, daß die Vorstellung jener Millionen systematisch in den Gaskammern umgebrachter Juden nur schwer glaubhaft war, um so mehr als die Anklage durch einen Mann erhoben wurde, der als Zeuge nicht annehmbarer war als Thomas Mann. Wie dem auch sei, es scheint keine Hinweise dafür zu geben, daß London daraufhin irgendwelche diplomatischen Interventionen unternommen hat.

Es gibt ferner den Bericht des Präsidenten des Komitees zur Rettung der Juden in Budapest, Dr. Rudolf Kastner. Der Bericht erwähnt Massenmorde an osteuropäischen Juden, von denen Kastner gegen Ende 1942 erfuhr, sowie Gaskammern, von deren Existenz er im Sommer 1943 Kenntnis erhielt. Kastner ist ein unmittelbarer Zeuge für das Geschehen in Ungarn und über einen von ihm geschaffenen Informationsdienst ein mittelbarer Zeuge für die Vorgänge in der Slowakei, in Böhmen und Mähren, Polen, Rumänien und Österreich. Der Einmarsch der deutschen Truppen in Ungarn erfolgte erst am 19. März 1944. Bis zu diesem Zeitpunkt stand Kastner in ungehindertem Nachrichtenaustausch mit einer parallel arbeitenden jüdischen Organisation in Konstantinopel, der früheren Hauptstadt der Türkei, eines neutralen Landes also, in dem die Juden niemals behelligt wurden. Es hat nicht den Anschein, als hätten die Deutschen nach der Besetzung Ungarns die

⁷² Der Kastner-Bericht über Eichmanns Menschenhandel in Ungarn, sowie Alex Weißberg, *Die Geschichte von Joel Brand*

Verbindungen zwischen den Budapester Juden und denen Konstantinopels unterbunden. Im Gegenteil⁷². So informierte Kastner also von Ende des Jahres 1942 an bis zur Invasion Ungarns durch die russischen Truppen die jüdische Organisation in Konstantinopel über alles, was er wußte oder zu wissen glaubte. Was allerdings danach aus den übermittelten Informationen wurde, ist nicht bekannt. Als Joel Brand, der von Eichmann zu den Alliierten entsandt wurde, um über den Tausch von einer Million Juden gegen zehntausend Lastkraftwagen zu verhandeln, am 18. Mai 1944 in Konstantinopel eintraf, lautete die erste Frage seiner dortigen jüdischen Briefpartner an ihn: „... Ist es wahr, daß die Deportationen begonnen haben?“⁷³ Bald wurde ihm klar, daß die türkischen Juden nur sehr lose Beziehungen zur britischen und amerikanischen Botschaft besaßen. Als er ihnen nahelegte, ein Telegramm zu schicken, erhielt er zur Antwort: „... die Sache läßt sich nicht so übers Knie brechen ... wir sind nicht sicher, daß unsere Telegramme ... ankommen. Wir wissen nicht, ob sie nicht verstümmelt ankommen“⁷⁴.

Er berichtete ihnen sodann, was sich abspielte, fand damit jedoch keinen Glauben. Als es ihm schließlich gelang, mit Lord Moyne, dem britischen Beauftragten für Palästina, Kontakt aufzunehmen, ließ dieser ihn als Betrüger inhaftieren⁷⁵. Kurzum, der Kastner-Bericht wurde erst im Laufe des Sommers 1945 von seinem zu jener Zeit in die Schweiz geflüchteten Verfasser niedergeschrieben; am 13. Dezember 1945 fand er vor dem Internationalen Militärgerichtshof in Nürnberg⁷⁶ erstmalig offiziell Berücksichtigung, und erst 1961, zur Zeit des Eichmann-Prozesses⁷⁷, wurde er in deutscher Sprache und in einer vom Original sehr weit entfernten Fassung vom Kindler-Verlag München veröffentlicht.

Nur schwerlich läßt sich die Ansicht vertreten, daß man von Pius XII. hätte fordern können, besser informiert zu sein als die

⁷³ Weißberg, *Joel Brand*, S. 152

⁷⁴ Ebd., S. 157

⁷⁵ Ebd., S. 163 ff.

⁷⁶ *Prozeß gegen die Hauptkriegsverbrecher* (Nürnberg 1947) III, S. 560 f.

⁷⁷ S. P. Rassinier, *Zum Fall Eichmann: Was ist Wahrheit? oder Die unbelebten Sieger*

Alliierten. Demgegenüber wird man erwidern, daß er aber doch zumindest den Alliierten hätte Glauben schenken und ihre Informationen in der Form hätte akzeptieren können, in der sie sie ihm zukommen ließen, was insbesondere für das Schreiben Myron Taylors vom 26. September 1942 sowie für die Resolution der Alliierten vom 18. Dezember 1942⁷⁸ gilt. Doch — warum sollte er hinsichtlich dieser Informationen schließlich nicht dieselbe Zurückhaltung an den Tag legen wie die Alliierten selbst gegenüber ihren Auskunftgebern?

Sicherlich, überprüfen mußte er sie. Aber welche Mittel standen dem Papst hierfür zur Verfügung? Seine Nuntien hatte er, weiter nichts! Jedoch: In Polen besaß er keinen, da er sich geweigert hatte, diesen Staat in den von Hitler reduzierten Grenzen anzuerkennen. In der Slowakei, in Ungarn, in Ankara usw. verfügte er freilich über Nuntien. Tatsächlich hat er dann auch jedesmal, wenn diese ihm von irgendwelchen Erpressungen Kenntnis gaben, sich darüber informiert und ihnen Weisungen im Sinne eines diplomatischen Protestes erteilt. Nun, dem Leser ist bereits bekannt, welches Schicksal sämtlichen Protesten des Vatikans widerfuhr, die sich „schubladenweise“ in Ribbentrops Amtszimmer anhäuften. Joel Brand berichtet, daß der Papst in den Jahren 1941, 1942 und 1943 in der Slowakei und von Mai bis Juni 1944 in Ungarn wiederholt intervenierte, und zwar sowohl direkt als auch auf dem Wege über seine Nuntien⁷⁹. Im folgenden sehen wir, welchen Ausgang eine Intervention des Nuntius in Berlin, Msgr. Orsenigo, bei Hitler selbst nahm:

„In allerhöchstem Auftrag bin ich vor einigen Tagen nach Berchtesgaden geflogen. Ich wurde vom Führer und Kanzler Hitler empfangen, aber sobald ich das Thema Juden und Judentum ... angeschnitten hatte, drehte sich Hitler ab, ging ans Fenster und trommelte mit den Fingern gegen die Scheibe. Sie können sich vorstellen, wie peinlich es mir war, im Rücken meines Gesprächspartners mein Vorhaben vorzutragen. Ich tat es trotzdem. Dann drehte sich plötzlich Hitler um, ging an einen Tisch, wo ein Glas

⁷⁸ Vgl. oben S. 58

⁷⁹ Weißberg, *Joel Brand*

Wasser stand, faßte es und schleuderte es wütend auf den Boden. Mit dieser hochdiplomatischen ... Geste durfte ich meine Mission als beendet und gleichzeitig leider als abgelehnt betrachten⁸⁰.“

An folgenden Fakten, die man Pius XII. zum Vorwurf macht, ist nicht zu rütteln: daß seine Interventionen sich nur auf Tatsachen gründeten, die von seinen eigenen Informationsdiensten überprüft worden waren, daß sie stets auf dem diplomatischen Wege erfolgten und in einem dementsprechenden Stil abgefaßt waren (doch Nobécourt selbst bemerkt hinsichtlich Pius' X., daß ein Papst keine anderen Möglichkeiten habe⁸¹ — also warum Pius XII. absprechen, was man Pius X. durchaus zugestand?) und daß sie stets den Charakter von „Protesten gegen jegliche Grausamkeiten, von welcher Seite sie auch begangen sein mochten“, gewahrt haben — von Protesten jener Art, wie sie sich beispielsweise wegen der Luftangriffe gegen die Zivilbevölkerung an die Adresse der Engländer und Amerikaner richteten. Dies stellte die einzige Form des Protestes dar, die mit seinem apostolischen Auftrag, „ein Vater der gesamten Menschheit zu sein“, vereinbar war. Man kann seine Situation nur — wenn auch unvollkommen — mit der Lage jener Sabinerin vergleichen, die sich zwischen ihrem Bruder und ihrem Gatten hin- und hergerissen sieht, als diese auf Geheiß der Alten beider Lager sich kämpfend gegenüberstehen.

Der Papst wandte sich gegen den Krieg insgesamt. Es war jedoch nicht seine Aufgabe, zugunsten des einen und zum Schaden des anderen der beiden feindlichen Lager gegen einzelne Folgen des Krieges Stellung zu beziehen, und — es sei hier noch einmal gesagt — gerade diese Einstellung gereicht ihm zur Ehre.

Die Orientierung darüber, was Pius XII. wußte und wann er es erfuhr, sollte jedoch nur die Möglichkeit schaffen, die „Kronzeugen“ der Herren Hochhuth und Genossen richtig einzuschätzen. Darüber hinaus sollte sie deutlich machen, daß man ein allgemein anerkanntes Talent und zugleich moralisch ein Versager sein kann. Ausgenommen hiervon ist selbstverständlich Dr. Albert Schweit-

⁸⁰ Erklärung Msgr. Orsenigos gegenüber Professor Edoardo Senatra wenige Tage nach einer Intervention im November 1943. Die Erklärung wurde wiedergegeben im *Petrus Blatt*, dem Organ der Diözese Berlin, vom 7. April 1963.

⁸¹ Nobécourt, *Le Vicaire*, S.120

zer, dessen „Konsekration“ nicht auf seinen literarischen Fähigkeiten, sondern lediglich auf einem geschickt in den Dienst einer ausgeprägt kommerziellen Denkweise gestellten Exhibitionismus beruht.

V. SAUL FRIEDLÄNDER UND DIE DEUTSCHEN ARCHIVE

Besondere Erwähnung verdient einer der zahlreichen Ankläger dieses Prozesses, die sich im Anklagestand so ablösen, daß schon der nächste dasteht, wenn sein Vorgänger seine gesamten Beweisgründe erschöpft hat, gleichsam als wolle er dessen Schwächen verdecken: Es ist der allerletzte Ankläger, der auf dem Plan erscheint, der schon mehrfach erwähnte Saul Friedländer. Er wurde in Prag geboren, ist Bürger des Staates Israel und gelangte schon recht lange vor Erscheinen seines Buches *Pius XII. und das Dritte Reich*⁸² in den Vorteil einer für einen Autor beispiellosen Werbekampagne, die den Eindruck vermittelte, er ginge an das Studium der deutschen Unterlagen zum Fall *Stellvertreter* heran wie ein junger Wolf an die Schafe und er werde mit allen aufräumen, die an der Wohlbegründetheit der Hochhuthschen These Zweifel hegten — man werde schon sehen!

Man sah dann schließlich folgendes:

1. Ein Buch von 179 Seiten im Oktavformat, das ungefähr zu zwei Dritteln aus Kommentaren des Autors, Dokumenten nicht-deutscher Provenienz (von der Jewish Agency for Palestine, aus israelischen, englischen und amerikanischen Archiven), Entlehnungen von anderen Autoren (Poliakov, Nobécourt usw.) sowie einem Nachwort von Alfred Grosser besteht. Hieraus muß man schließen, daß jenes Bündel von Vatikan-Akten in den deutschen Archiven, das auf knapp 75 kleinen Seiten Platz findet, wahrhaftig

⁸² Deutsche Ausgabe von *Pie XII et le III^e Reich*, erschienen bei Rowohlt 1965. Dieses Buch stellt im übrigen nur eine Paraphrase des bei McGraw-Hill (New York 1964) erschienenen Werkes von Guenter Lewy, *The Catholic Church and Nazi Germany*, dar. Da dieses letztgenannte Werk noch nicht in französischer Übersetzung vorliegt, wurde eine Bezugnahme darauf vom Autor als nicht zweckmäßig erachtet. Im übrigen bedeuten die Bemerkungen zu dem Werk von Friedländer gleichzeitig auch eine Stellungnahme zu dem des Verlages McGraw-Hill.

sehr dürftig ist, und ferner, daß die Beziehungen zwischen dem Vatikan und dem Dritten Reich sehr locker waren. Freilich gibt Friedländer an, er habe nur fünf Ordner mit Akten vorgefunden und der fünfte habe auf einen sechsten hingewiesen, der jedoch verschwunden sei. Und wenn nun dieser sechste einen siebten ankündigte, der siebte wiederum einen achten usw.? Dieses Verschwinden von Dokumenten, deren Anzahl nicht abgeschätzt werden kann, zwingt den Autor, seine Nachforschungen nicht weiter als bis zum 16. Oktober 1943 zu führen. Aus freien Stücken dagegen fängt er erst am 3. März 1939 an. Die Beziehungen zwischen Pius XII. und dem Dritten Reich begannen indessen bereits am 30. Januar 1933 — zu einer Zeit also, als er noch der Kardinalstaatssekretär Pacelli war — und setzten sich bis in den April 1945 hinein fort. Dies bedeutet, daß die Forschungen Friedländers sich nur auf viereinhalb von insgesamt zwölf Jahren erstrecken. Die Untersuchung ist also zeitlich eingeschränkt, dazu aber auch noch in ihrem Aspekt einseitig, denn Friedländer stellt uns Pius XII. nicht nach den Vatikan-Akten des Reichsaußenministeriums dar, sondern lediglich anhand der Korrespondenz des deutschen Botschafters beim Vatikan mit dem Staatssekretär des Auswärtigen Amtes. Hierbei gibt er jedoch nur die Berichte des Botschafters selbst oder seiner Mitarbeiter, hingegen niemals die Texte der Instruktionen, die als Anlaß dazu dienten. Während das Bestreben der modernen Historiker mehr und mehr dahin geht, die Fakten in ihren historischen Zusammenhang hinsichtlich Zeit und Raum zu stellen, um so ein Höchstmaß an Objektivität zu erreichen, erblickt man bei Friedländer die Neigung, die Fakten so weit wie möglich aus diesem Zusammenhang herauszureißen.

2. Da die Untersuchungen erst beim 3. März 1939 beginnen, gestattet es die zeitliche Beschränkung seiner Forschung, die Beziehungen Pius' XII. mit dem Dritten Reich für den gesamten Zeitraum vom 30. Januar 1933 bis 3. März 1939 mit Stillschweigen zu übergehen. Sehen wir doch, wozu das führt:

Am 3. März 1939 verfaßte Graf Du Moulin, der Leiter des Referats für Angelegenheiten des Vatikans im Berliner Auswärtigen Amt, eine Charakteristik des am Vortage gewählten Papstes. In dieser Aufzeichnung heißt es: „Abgesprochen wird ihm ... eine

Mitwirkung an der Gewaltpolitik Pius' XI. ... Mit aller Entschiedenheit setzte er sich dem Drängen der Intransigenten entgegen und trat gleichzeitig für Verständigung und Versöhnung ein⁸³.“ Am gleichen Tage beglückwünschten sich aber die französischen Zeitungen *Le Populaire* (sozialistisch) und *L'Humanité* (kommunistisch) zur Wahl eines antifaschistischen und antinazistischen Papstes⁸⁴. Die deutsche Pressekampagne anlässlich der Frankreichreise Kardinal Pacellis im Jahre 1937 sowie den Ausspruch im *Angriff*⁸⁵, der Zeitschrift Goebbels': „Pius XI. ist zur Hälfte Jude, Pacelli ist es ganz“, hatte Du Moulin in seiner Darstellung völlig unberücksichtigt gelassen. Es ist andererseits bekannt, daß der wirkliche Verfasser der Enzyklika *Mit brennender Sorge* vom 14. März 1937, die eine schonungslose Verdammung des Nationalsozialismus darstellte, Kardinal Pacelli, der spätere Pius XII., war, obwohl die Enzyklika von Pius XI. unterzeichnet wurde. Von dieser Tatsache, die Du Moulin ebenfalls ausgelassen hatte, weiß man durch Msgr. Paganuzzi, einen der engsten Mitarbeiter Pius' XI. und Pius' XII., der in der italienischen Wochenzeitschrift *Vita* darüber folgendes erklärte:

„Als die Veröffentlichung der berühmten Verurteilung des Nationalsozialismus unmittelbar bevorstand, empfing Pius XI. gemeinsam mit Kardinal Pacelli zwei deutsche Kardinäle in Privataudienz: Faulhaber und — ich weiß nicht mehr — Schultz aus Köln oder Bertram aus Breslau.

Der Papst gab ihnen den endgültigen Text der Enzyklika zu lesen und fragte sie, was sie davon hielten und was sie dazu zu sagen hätten. Die beiden Kardinäle beglückwünschten den Papst zu der begründeten Aufdeckung der Irrtümer des Nationalsozialismus sowie zu der detaillierten Ablehnung der Anschauungen, die zum Sittengesetz, zum Naturrecht und zum bestehenden Gesetz in Widerspruch stünden. Sie betonten hierbei, daß eben diese nationalsozialistischen Anschauungen für das mißliche Verhältnis

⁸³ Note Du Moulin's an Ribbentrop vom 3. März 1939, zitiert bei Friedländer, *Pius XII.*, S. 17 f.

⁸⁴ Vgl. Anhang I

⁸⁵ 3. Juni 1937, zitiert nach *Le Monde et la Vie*, Januar 1964 (Rückübers. — Anm. d. Übers.)

verantwortlich seien, das nicht nur zwischen der Kirche und dem Reich, sondern auch zwischen der Kirche und der Gesamtheit der deutschen Katholiken bestehe.

Der alte Papst war über die Komplimente und die Zustimmung der beiden deutschen Kardinäle offensichtlich erfreut. Schließlich deutete er mit dem Finger auf Kardinal Pacelli, und nach einer bedeutungsvollen Pause erklärte er (Pius XI.) langsam: „Danken Sie ihm ... Es ist alles sein Werk ... Er ist es jetzt, der alles macht“⁸⁶.“

Und der unwiderlegbare Beweis hierfür wurde durch *La France catholique* erbracht, die die Photokopie von einem Teil eines Korrekturbogens dieser Enzyklika veröffentlichte⁸⁷, auf dem keine *typographischen* Korrekturen, sondern *Autorenkorrekturen* von der Hand Kardinal Pacellis erscheinen.

Durch Pater Leiber schließlich weiß man, daß sämtliche Proteste des Vatikans gegen die wiederholten Verletzungen des Konkordats⁸⁹, das vom Dritten Reich mit dem Vatikan abgeschlossen worden war und das bereits am Tage nach seiner Unterzeichnung sowie später noch unzählige Male verletzt wurde, aus der Feder des Staatssekretärs Pacelli stammen, der als Vater des Konkordatsrechts — es war von ihm geschaffen worden — im übrigen als einziger imstande war, diese Proteste zu formulieren. Durch *La Documentation catholique*, die diese Angaben aus den *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* übernimmt, weiß man ferner, daß es seiner Initiative zu verdanken war, daß die *Suprema Sacra Congregazione del Sant'Offizio* Bücher verurteilte wie *Der Mythos des 20. Jahrhunderts* von

⁸⁶ Zitiert nach *L'Homme nouveau* v. 19. April 1964

⁸⁷ 4. Dezember 1964

⁸⁸ Pater Leiber zählte bis Ende 1937 „mehr als 55“ solcher Proteste (*Stimmen der Zeit*, März 1962, und *Revue des Questions allemandes*, Juli-August 1963). Die bedeutendsten davon wurden durch Michele Maccarrone veröffentlicht (*Il Nationalsocialismo e la Santa Sede*, Rom 1947). Noch während der Drucklegung dieses Buches erscheint in Deutschland ein Werk, in dem 111 dieser Proteste in vollem Wortlaut wiedergegeben werden: *Der Notenwechsel zwischen dem Hl. Stuhl und der deutschen Reichsregierung* von Dieter Albrecht. Indem Friedländer seine Forschungen mit dem 3. März 1939 beginnen läßt, verzichtet er ganz einfach darauf, diese Noten zu erwähnen. Man kann die Redlichkeit eines solchen Vorgehens nur bewundern.

Alfred Rosenberg⁸⁹, *Die deutsche Nationalkirche* von Ernst Bergmann⁹⁰ (ein Werk über das gleiche Thema wie das vorige, nämlich den Mythos der Rasse und des Blutes), *Die Einwanderung Israels in Kanaan* von Abt Friedrich Schmidtke, Professor an der theologischen Fakultät der Universität Breslau⁹¹, und andere, außerdem Entscheidungen der Reichsregierung wie die Sterilisation von Erbkranken⁹² und die Tötung (Euthanasie) der unheilbar Kranken, die eine schwere Belastung für die Gesellschaft darstellen⁹³. Friedländers Methode läßt es zu, all dies mit Stillschweigen zu übergehen und uns einen Pius XII. zu zeigen, der mit der wahren historischen Gestalt nicht mehr gemein hat als der Pius XII. Hochhuths. Sie gestattet es ihm sogar, zu schreiben: „Nur das Archiv des Vatikans kann Auskunft darüber geben, ob die Predigten des Bischofs Graf Galen von Münster, der im August 1941 öffentlich gegen die Tötung von Geisteskranken protestierte und Hitler drängte, diese Aktion abzubrechen, auf eine Weisung des Papstes zurückgingen oder der persönlichen Initiative des Bischofs zu danken waren⁹⁴.“

Dies beweist, daß er diese Predigten noch nicht einmal gelesen hat, denn sie beziehen sich unmißverständlich auf den Beschluß der *Suprema Sacra Congregazione del Sant'Offizio* vom 2. Dezember 1940, der den Wert einer „päpstlichen Weisung“ besitzt und in diesem Fall sogar eine persönliche Weisung des Papstes darstellt, da er unter seinem Pontifikat gefaßt wurde.

Die gleiche Methode erlaubt ihm schließlich die Behauptung: „Möglicherweise erinnert man sich daran, daß der frühere Nuntius in München und Berlin der Initiator des Konkordates zwischen dem Heiligen Stuhl und dem Dritten Reich gewesen ist⁹⁵ ...“, wobei er noch nicht einmal bemerkt, daß er selbst ein Dokument

Die vollständigen Texte dieser Verurteilungen, die sämtlich kategorisch und unwiderruflich sind, finden sich unter den nebenstehenden Daten in *La Documentation catholique*, 5, rue Bayard, Paris, oder in lateinischer Sprache in den *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, Bd. 30.

⁸⁹ Verurteilt am 9. 2. 1934

⁹⁰ Verurteilt am 14. 2. 1934

⁹¹ Verurteilt am 14. 3. 1934

⁹² Verurteilt am 21. 2. 1940

⁹³ Verurteilt am 2. 12. 1940

⁹⁴ Friedländer, *Pius XII.*, S. 57.

⁹⁵ Ebd., S. 18.

anführt, in dem gesagt ist, daß „das Reichskonkordat aus einem deutschen Wunsch entstanden sei“⁹⁶.

3. Die Beschränkung der Untersuchung auf die Berichte eines Botschafters ermöglicht Bemerkungen wie diese hier: Zur gleichen Zeit, als Tittmann von der diplomatischen Vertretung Roosevelts am Vatikan sich mit den Antworten des Papstes auf seine Vorstellungen zur Weihnachtsbotschaft 1942 einverstanden erklärte, wie auch insbesondere mit den Worten, daß diese Botschaft „vom amerikanischen Volk gut aufgenommen werden müsse“⁹⁷, beglückwünschte sich der deutsche Botschafter von Bergen — der seinen Posten am Vatikan bis zum 4. Juli 1943 innehatte — gegenüber seiner Regierung, daß eben dieser Papst dem Ersuchen der Angelsachsen hinsichtlich einer alleinigen Verurteilung der nationalsozialistischen Verbrechen nicht nachgäbe. Kurz gesagt, den Berichten der beiden Botschafter zufolge müßte jedermann mit dieser Weihnachtsbotschaft 1942 zufrieden gewesen sein! Es ist jedoch wohlbekannt, daß dies keineswegs der Fall war: In Wirklichkeit war jeder unzufrieden. Die Deutschen waren es, weil die Weihnachtsbotschaft zu deutlich war — doch ihr Botschafter bewies ihnen, daß das nichts zu bedeuten habe, indem er hervorhob, mit welcher Herzlichkeit er vom Papst empfangen worden sei, oder indem er auf Informationen aus maßgeblichen Quellen hinwies, auf Grund deren man versichern dürfe, „mit seinem Herzen . . . stehe Pius XII. auf seiten der Achsenmächte“⁹⁸. Die Amerikaner hingegen waren unzufrieden, weil die Weihnachtsbotschaft nicht deutlich genug war — doch ihr Botschafter erklärte ihnen, daß sie trotz allem eindeutig sei, wodurch zu verstehen gegeben wurde, daß sie zu keinerlei Zweifeln Anlaß gäbe, daß man auf dem richtigen Wege sei und daß man schon zum Ziele kommen werde.

Gegenüber Berichten von Botschaftern muß man vorsichtig sein. Jeder Historiker weiß, daß es einem Botschafter vor allem darum

⁹⁶ Ebd., S. 127. Telegramm Weizsäckers vom 5. Juli 1943, in dem dieser über die Privataudienz berichtet, die ihm anlässlich der Überreichung seines Beglaubigungsschreibens gewährt wurde.

⁹⁷ Vgl. oben S. 36

⁹⁸ Brief Menschausens an das Reichsaußenministerium, zitiert bei Friedländer, *Pius XII.*, S. 66.

zu tun ist, seinen Einfluß auf die Regierung, bei der er akkreditiert ist, hervorzuheben. Er weiß ferner, daß die Darstellung, die ein Botschafter von einer Angelegenheit gibt, die sich auf die Außenpolitik seiner eigenen Regierung bezieht, sowie seine Darstellung der Reaktionen, die die Außenpolitik seiner Regierung bei der Regierung seines Amtssitzes hervorruft, nur Wert besitzen, wenn man sie mit den Berichten der anderen Botschaften dieses Ortes über dieselbe Angelegenheit und dieselben Reaktionen vergleicht oder mit den ausgetauschten diplomatischen Notizen, die die Folge einer erfolgreichen Tätigkeit des Botschafters sind. Die diplomatische Mission Bergens und Weizsäckers war ein völliger Mißerfolg, und beide waren daher nur um so mehr geneigt, den Mißerfolg der Botschafter der Alliierten herauszustellen und ihn aus den Sympathien des Papstes für die Achsenmächte zu erklären, die auf ihrer eigenen Persönlichkeit und Tätigkeit beruhten.

Doch worin bestand die diplomatische Mission eines Botschafters der Reichsregierung beim Heiligen Stuhl? Hierüber sind wir durch den Bericht über ein Gespräch, das Ribbentrop persönlich am 11. März 1940 im Vatikan mit Pius XII. und anschließend mit dessen Staatssekretär, Msgr. Maglione, führte, sehr genau unterrichtet: „Der Führer ist der Ansicht“, sagte Ribbentrop, „daß eine grundsätzliche Einigung zwischen Nationalsozialismus und katholischer Kirche durchaus möglich sei. Es habe aber keinen Zweck, das Verhältnis zwischen beiden durch Anschneiden von Einzelfragen dieser oder jener Art oder durch provisorische Vereinbarungen regeln zu wollen. Vielmehr müsse es einmal zu einer umfassenden, sozusagen säkularen Klärung des Verhältnisses kommen, die dann eine wirklich dauerhafte Grundlage für eine harmonische Zusammenarbeit der Faktoren bilde ... Außerdem sei zu bedenken, daß die Verständigung zwischen Nationalsozialismus und katholischer Kirche von einer Kardinalvoraussetzung abhängen, davon nämlich, daß die katholische Geistlichkeit in Deutschland auf jede wie immer geartete Form politischer Betätigung verzichte und sich ausschließlich auf die ihr allein zukommende seelsorgliche Tätigkeit beschränke. Die Erkenntnis der Notwendigkeit einer solchen radikalen Scheidung könne aber heute bei den katholischen Geistlichen in Deutschland noch nicht als herrschend ange-

sehen werden ... Die katholische Geistlichkeit müsse sich erst fortschreitend von der Erkenntnis durchdringen lassen, daß mit dem Nationalsozialismus eine ganz neue Form des gesamten staatlichen und völkischen Lebens in die Welt getreten sei⁹⁹.“

Der Fall ist eindeutig: Es geht um eine Revision des Konkordats, das dem deutschen Klerus (insbesondere durch seinen Artikel 31 über die Jugendorganisationen) eine gewisse politische Bewegungsfreiheit beläßt, die Hitler unerträglich ist. Zwar erklärt Pius XII. sich einverstanden hinsichtlich der „erwähnten konkreten Tatsachen“, doch geht er nicht näher darauf ein und „sucht ... das Gespräch auf bestimmte Einzelprobleme und Beschwerden der Kurie zu bringen“. Der Reichsaußenminister bricht jedoch dieses Thema ab und betont „erneut die Notwendigkeit einer ... grundsätzlichen und umfassenden Klärung des Gesamtverhältnisses zwischen Staat und Kirche“.

Die Aufgabe des Botschafters von Bergen und seines Nachfolgers bestand demnach darin, Pius XII. wenn nicht zu einem diplomatischen Notenwechsel mit dem Ziele einer Änderung des Konkordats, so doch zumindest zu einer Erklärung zu veranlassen, die der katholischen Geistlichkeit in Deutschland den Gedanken eines Verzichts auf die Ausübung ihres politischen Einflusses sowie die Vorstellung nahegelegt hätte, daß mit dem Nationalsozialismus eine ganz neue Form des gesamten staatlichen und völkischen Lebens in die Welt getreten sei. Mitten im Kriege kam das einer Stellungnahme zugunsten der Achsenmächte gleich. Da es Bergen nicht gelang, diesen Auftrag auszuführen, wurde er in dem Augenblick, als der Führer und Ribbentrop die Überzeugung gewannen, daß er keinerlei Aussicht auf Erfolg mehr hatte, durch Weizsäcker ersetzt.

Dies hinderte ihn nicht, die Wirkung, die er im Rahmen seiner Amtsgeschäfte entfaltet hatte, bis zum Äußersten hervorzuheben. An dem Tage, an dem er beauftragt wurde, das *Agrément* für seinen Nachfolger einzuholen, richtete er an sein Ministerium einen Brief, in dem er die Verwirrung im Vatikan schilderte und

⁹⁹ Zitiert bei Friedländer, *Pius XII.*, S. 41 ff., nach *Akten zur deutschen auswärtigen Politik* D VIII S. 704 ff.

darauf hinwies, daß er auf Grund der „besonders gelagerten Beziehungen“, die er dort angeknüpft hatte — er hatte diesen Posten am Vatikan seit 1920 inne! —, der einzige sei, der dort Erfolg haben könnte, und daß ein solcher Wechsel zu einem solchen Zeitpunkt unmöglich wäre¹⁰⁰.

Sein Nachfolger Weizsäcker blieb nicht lange genug auf seinem Posten, um Hitler seinen Mißerfolg deutlich werden zu lassen.

Man muß im übrigen nicht nur gegenüber Berichten von Botschaftern vorsichtig sein, sondern auch gegenüber der gesamten diplomatischen Ausdrucksweise, die nämlich nicht nur für Botschafter, sondern auch für Staatsoberhäupter charakteristisch ist. Hierfür ein Beispiel: Pius XI., den man wegen seiner über jeden Zweifel erhabenen antinationalsozialistischen Einstellung zu Pius XII. in Gegensatz stellt, begrüßte den in der Angelegenheit des Konkordats gekommenen von Papen bei seiner Ankunft im Vatikan mit den Worten, „wie ‚beglückt‘ er sei, ‚in Hitler eine Persönlichkeit an der Spitze der deutschen Regierung zu sehen, die den kompromißlosen Kampf gegen Kommunismus und Nihilismus auf ihre Fahnen geschrieben‘ habe¹⁰¹“. Und Max Gallo¹⁰² führt von ihm eine recht beträchtliche Anzahl ähnlicher, an Mussolini gerichteter Aussprüche an. Es handelt sich hierbei um Äußerungen, die lediglich den Wert von Höflichkeitsformeln besitzen — zweifellos bedauerliche Äußerungen, doch Worte, die zu den guten Sitten gerechnet werden wie die Begrüßungsworte der Gastgeberin beim Empfang ihrer Gäste¹⁰³.

Die gesamte Anhängerschaft des *Stellvertreter* sieht darin indessen kein Hindernis, das Andenken von Pius XI. zu bewei-

¹⁰⁰ Brief Bergens an das Reichsaußenministerium vom 6. April 1943, zitiert bei Friedländer, *Pius XII.*, S. 12.

¹⁰¹ Zitiert bei Hochhuth, *Stellvertreter*, S. 235.

¹⁰² *L'Italie de Mussolini*

¹⁰³ Ähnliche Äußerungen verzeichnet man von nahezu allen Politikern bei der Erfüllung ihrer Repräsentationspflichten. Nachstehend einige Beispiele:

„Wir glauben an die Redlichkeit und Aufrichtigkeit Hitlers.“ (Lord Beaverbrook, *Daily Express* v. 31. Oktober 1938.)

„Diejenigen, die mit Hitler in der Öffentlichkeit zusammenkamen, ob in dienstlichen Angelegenheiten oder aus gesellschaftlichen Gründen, hielten ihn für äußerst sachverständig, gelassen und wohlinformiert, und manch einer war beeindruckt durch seine angenehmen Umgangsformen, sein entwaffnen-

räuchern und das von Pius XII., der weder Hitler noch Mussolini, geschweige denn ihren Vertretern gegenüber, jemals stärkere und vielleicht noch nicht einmal gleichstarke Äußerungen tat, der öffentlichen Verachtung preiszugeben.

4. Schließlich bleibt noch die Darstellungsweise zu erwähnen, in der Friedländer sein Material präsentiert. Er gibt zu, daß es sehr unvollständig ist, räumt ein, daß die Berichte von Botschaftern verdächtig sind, daß ihm gewisse Unterlagen für die Beurteilung fehlen usw. Er ist jedoch nichtsdestoweniger der Ansicht, daß die von ihm zitierten Dokumente jedes für sich genommen sehr bedeutsam sind und in ihrer Gesamtheit „einen nützlichen Beitrag“ für die Untersuchung des Themas darstellen oder „einen unbestreitbaren historischen Wert“ für das Verständnis der Ereignisse besitzen¹⁰⁴.

Denken wir nur daran, wie in der Zusammenfassung des Werkes die „Vorliebe [Pius' XII.] für Deutschland . . . , an der die Natur des nationalsozialistischen Regimes nichts änderte“, hervorgehoben wird. Als ob nicht auch Frankreich — trotz „Väterchen Combes“¹⁰⁵ zu Beginn dieses Jahrhunderts — für Pius X. „die älteste Tochter der Kirche“ geblieben wäre! Der Ausdruck „Vorliebe für Deutschland“ und viele andere mit der gleichen Sinngebung Wer-

des Lächeln und seine persönliche Anziehungskraft.“ (Winston Churchill, *Great Contemporaries*, 1939, S. 268.)

„ . . . Der Führer ist ein großer Menschenführer, und aus diesem Grunde bewundere ich ihn.“ (Churchill, ebd., S. 296.)

„Der römische Geist, der durch Mussolini, den größten lebenden Gesetzgeber, verkörpert wird, hat zahlreichen Nationen gezeigt, daß man dem Druck des Sozialismus widerstehen kann, und den Weg vorgezeichnet, den eine Nation gehen kann, wenn sie mutig geführt wird.“ (Churchill in Queen's Hall, auf dem Kongreß der antisozialistischen Liga, 18. Februar 1933.)

„Der Faschismus ist eine heilsame Reaktion gegen den Bolschewismus.“ (Lord Curzon beim Empfang Mussolinis in Lausanne am 20. Oktober 1922.)

„Ich empfinde für Mussolini größte Achtung und größte Bewunderung. Er ist ein Mann von überaus großer Charakterstärke und beachtlichem Scharfsinn. Sein persönliches Verhalten ist von großem Charme und vollendeter Schlichtheit geprägt.“ (Chamberlain nach seiner Begegnung mit Mussolini in Livorno am 30. September 1926. Zitiert bei Max Gallo, *L'Italie de Mussolini*, S. 255.)

¹⁰⁴ Friedländer, *Pius XII.*, S. 14 und 16

¹⁰⁵ Émile Combes, ehemaliger Ministerpräsident (1902 bis 1905), leidenschaftlicher Verfechter einer antiklerikalen Politik. (Anm. d. Übers.)

den jedesmal in einer Weise vorgetragen, daß der Leser hierfür in Gedanken „für den Nationalsozialismus“ einsetzt. Ein kleiner Verstoß gegen seine Pflichten als Autor.

Oder denken wir daran, in welchem Maße die Aufmerksamkeit auf das Schreiben gelenkt wird, mit dem Pius XII. Hitler von seiner Wahl unterrichtet. An dieser Stelle zitiert Friedländer Msgr. Giovannetti¹⁰⁶: „In seinem Umfang and den zum Ausdruck kommenden Empfindungen hat er [dieser Brief] nicht seinesgleichen unter den anderen damals vom Vatikan versandten amtlichen Schreiben.“ Dieser Kommentar „suggeriert“ eine besondere Sympathie für Hitler. Doch wie hätte dieser Brief auch anders als abweichend von den anderen amtlichen Schreiben sein können? Mit welchem anderen Staat hatte der Vatikan derart schwierige Probleme zu regeln wie mit Deutschland? Man braucht nur bei Msgr. Giovannetti selbst nachzulesen, um festzustellen, daß seine Bemerkung in diesem Sinne gemeint war.

Eine Methode, Texte zu zitieren: „In Norwegen gibt es nur 2000 Katholiken; daher muß der Heilige Stuhl, auch wenn er in moralischer Hinsicht ein strenges Urteil fällt [über die Invasion Norwegens durch die deutschen Truppen], in praktischer Hinsicht an die dreißig Millionen deutscher Katholiken denken¹⁰⁷.“ Geht man auf das Werk von Abt Paul Duclos zurück, der diesen Text als ein Zitat aus dem *Osservatore Romano* anführt, so stellt man fest, daß der Text auch nicht aus dieser letztgenannten Quelle, sondern von einem anderen Autor, G.-L. Jaray¹⁰⁸, stammt, der ihn *ohne Quellenangabe* anführt. Man stellt ferner fest, daß Duclos den Text als „zynisch“ bezeichnet and hinzugefügt hat, daß er, *falls*

¹⁰⁶ Alberto Giovannetti, *Der Vatikan und der Krieg*, S. 36

¹⁰⁷ Text, der dem *Osservatore Romano* zugeschrieben and nach Abt Paul Duclos, *Le Vatican et la Seconde Guerre mondiale*, S. 58 f. zitiert wird. Friedländer, der diese Stelle im Anschluß an die Proteste des Papstes gegen die Invasion Belgiens, Hollands and Luxemburgs anführt, will darauf aufmerksam machen, daß die Invasion Norwegens keinerlei Protest seitens des Heiligen Stuhles auslöste, was ihm die Möglichkeit gibt, die folgende Frage zu stellen (wenn er auch mittels einer in solchen Fällen üblichen Floskel, vor einer derartigen Schlußfolgerung „zurückscheut“): „Verurteilt der Papst Gewalt and Aggression nur dann ... wenn die Opfer katholisch sind?“ (Friedländer, *Pius XII.*, S. 47). Man sieht, was hier dem Leser eingeredet werden soll.

¹⁰⁸ *Messages de guerre*

er auf den *Osservatore Romano* zurückginge, nur „das Werk eines Redaktionsassistenten sein könne und der Zensur der Zeitung entgangen sei“. Doch Friedländer hat sich wohl gehütet, den ungekürzten Wortlaut zu zitieren.

Ein weiterer kleiner Verstoß: Es ist bekannt, daß Friedländer, was die Verurteilung der Euthanasie durch den Bischof Graf Galen von Münster betrifft, nicht weiß, ob sie „der persönlichen Initiative des Bischofs zu danken“ war oder „auf eine Weisung des Papstes“ zurückging¹⁰⁹, and es ist ebenfalls bekannt, daß er nur deshalb nicht weiß, daß diese Verurteilung gemäß den Weisungen des Papstes erfolgte, weil er entweder die maßgeblichen Texte nicht herangezogen hat oder weil er in der Absicht, dem Leser etwas zu suggerieren, tat, als hätte er sie nicht herangezogen. Doch als der Erzbischof Constantini in der Basilika von Concordia (Provinz Venedig) eine Ansprache hielt, in der er sagte: „Wir wünschen von ganzem Herzen, daß diese Schlacht [gemeint ist der Kampf der deutschen und italienischen Soldaten an der russischen Front] uns den abschließenden Sieg and den Untergang des ... Bolschewismus bringen möge“, wobei er „den Segen Gottes auf [diejenigen herabrief], die in dieser entscheidenden Stunde das Ideal unserer Freiheit gegen die rote Barbarei verteidigen“¹¹⁰, berichtete die deutsche Vatikanbotschaft nach Berlin, daß „sie [diese Ansprache] unmöglich ohne Einverständnis des Heiligen Stuhls gehalten worden sei“¹¹¹ — wofür im übrigen nicht der geringste Beleg gegeben wird —, and Friedländer schließt sich dieser Ansicht an, indem er folgert, daß „Menshausens ... Bericht *anscheinend* [sic] recht *plausibel* [sic] die Haltung Pius' XII. beschreibt“¹¹².

Das gleiche Verfahren wird beim *Osservatore Romano* angewandt: Wenn diese Zeitung über die Kriegführung zufällig eine Meldung bringt, die Friedländer anfechtbar erscheint, so versäumt er niemals zu bemerken, daß dieses Blatt die Meinung des Papstes widerspiegele. Doch wenn diese Zeitung ein nach Ermessen des

¹⁰⁹ Vgl. oben Anm. 93

¹¹⁰ Brief Menshausens, eines Mitarbeiters Bergens im Auswärtigen Amt, vom 23. Januar 1941, zitiert bei Friedländer, *Pius XII.*, S. 62–65

¹¹¹ Ebd., S. 66

¹¹² Vgl. oben S. 65 ff.

Papstes ausreichendes Kommuniqué über einen Vorfall veröffentlicht, so versäumt Friedländer es ebensowenig, darauf hinzuweisen, daß der *Osservatore Romano* gesprochen, der Papst hingegen geschwiegen habe, wodurch dem Leser die Vorstellung vermittelt wird, daß das Blatt in diesem Falle nicht die Meinung des Papstes widerspiegele.

Man muß von den Tatsachen ausgehen: Am 14. März 1937 verurteilte der Vatikan den Nationalsozialismus (Enzyklika *Mit brennender Sorge*) und am 19. desselben Monats den Bolschewismus (Enzyklika *Divini Redemptoris*). Da diese beiden Verurteilungen in der Folgezeit keinerlei Änderungen erfuhren, in den *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* zumindest nichts derartiges berichtet wird, darf angenommen werden, daß sie immer noch in demselben Sinne gültig sind, in dem sie abgefaßt wurden. Hinsichtlich der Verurteilung des Nationalsozialismus ist diese Ansicht noch um so mehr berechtigt, als sie unter Pius XII. wie schon unter Pius XI. mehrmals wiederholt wurde¹¹² was bei der Verurteilung des Bolschewismus nicht der Fall war. Nun präsentiert Friedländer jedoch seine Unterlagen derart, daß er in den daran anschließenden Kommentaren deutlich das Gegenteil aussagt, nämlich daß Pius XII. zwar die durch Pius XI. ausgesprochene Verurteilung des Bolschewismus aus Furcht vor diesem unvermindert aufrechterhalten, jedoch die Verurteilung des Nationalsozialismus — wenn nicht theoretisch, so doch praktisch — unaufhörlich zurückgenommen habe, da er ihn als das einzige halbwegs wirksame Bollwerk gegen die Ausbreitung des Bolschewismus betrachtet habe.

In seinem Text findet man Widersprüche wie diesen: „... nimmt Pius XII. niemals offen gegen die Sowjetunion Stellung¹¹³.“ Doch, sagt Friedländer, seit dem Kriegseintritt Deutschlands gegen Rußland „beunruhigt Pius XII. vor allem eine mögliche Ausdehnung des Kommunismus infolge des Krieges¹¹⁴.“ Oder er bemerkt: „Vom Frühjahr 1943 an scheint [sic] die Furcht vor der Bolschewisierung Europas bei den politischen Überlegungen des Heiligen Stuhles den Ausschlag zu geben¹¹³.“ Oder an anderer Stelle hören wir:

¹¹³ Friedländer, *Pius XII.*, S. 124

¹¹⁴ Ebd., S. 58 f.

„Auf der anderen Seite fürchtete Pius XII. nichts mehr [auch nicht den Nationalsozialismus also. P. Rassinier] als eine Bolschewisierung Europas und hegte anscheinend [sic] die Hoffnung, ein mit den westlichen Alliierten ... versöhntes Hitlerdeutschland könnte zum wichtigsten Bollwerk gegen jedes Vordringen der Sowjetunion nach Westen werden¹¹⁵.“

Wenn diese These ihre Wahrscheinlichkeit aus den Berichten der deutschen Botschafter beim Vatikan, Bergen und Weizsäcker, herleitet, so werden deren Berichte leider weder durch irgendeinen Text noch durch irgendwelche Handlungen Pius' XII. erhärtet.

Friedländer findet trotzdem etwas, um seine These zu stützen. So zum Beispiel jene Ansprache des Papstes am 18. Oktober 1939 beim Empfang des neuen diplomatischen Vertreters Litauens beim Heiligen Stuhl:

„Aber gerade die Pflicht dieses Unseres Amtes gestattet Uns nicht, die Augen zu schließen, wenn ausgerechnet für das Heil der Seelen neue unermessliche Gefahren heraufsteigen, wenn über das Antlitz (des christlichen) Europa in allen seinen Grundlinien sich täglich drohender und näher der unheilvolle Schatten des Denkens und Wirkens der Feinde Gottes breitet¹¹⁶.“

Die Interpretation Friedländers hierzu lautet: „Msgr. Giovannetti zitiert diese Äußerungen und schreibt, der Papst habe damit auf die ‚furchtbare Bedrohung durch den gottlosen Kommunismus‘ angespielt und es ‚als seine Hirtenpflicht‘ betrachtet, ‚davor zu warnen‘¹¹⁷.“

Liest man nun aber bei Giovannetti nach, so stellt man fest, daß er diese Äußerung dem Zeitpunkt zuordnet, als Polen gerade zwischen Deutschland und Rußland aufgeteilt worden war und die baltischen Staaten sich nunmehr direkt bedroht sahen. In dieser Situation stellt jener „unheilvolle Schatten des Denkens und Wirkens der Feinde Gottes, der sich täglich drohender und näher über das Antlitz Europas breitet“, den des Nationalsozialismus *und* des Bolschewismus dar. Da für das Baltikum, wozu Litauen gehört, an

¹¹⁵ Ebd., S. 163

¹¹⁶ Ebd., S. 44

¹¹⁷ Ebd., S. 45

das der Papst sich über die Person des litauischen Botschafters wendet, bis dahin von Bolschewismus keine Rede gewesen war, *spielt* Pius XII. *nicht an auf* die furchtbare Bedrohung durch den gottlosen Kommunismus, wie Friedländer behauptet, sondern, wie Giovannetti sagt, er „*erweiterte das Thema und sprach von ... der furchtbaren Bedrohung durch den gottlosen Kommunismus usw.*“¹¹⁸. Ein feiner Unterschied ist immerhin da. Denn wenn die Verurteilung auf den Kommunismus „erweitert“ wird, dann zielt sie ebenso auch auf den Nationalsozialismus ab, der ja auch ein „Feind Gottes“ ist. Woraus man wieder einmal sieht, daß die Sorge, die Texte so zu zitieren, daß Wortlaut und Bedeutung gewahrt bleiben, Friedländer nicht gerade schlaflose Nächte bereitet.

Tatsächlich stehen ausnahmslos alle Ansprachen, die Pius XII. während des gesamten Krieges hielt, im Einklang mit den beiden von Pius XI. unterzeichneten Enzykliken *Mit brennender Sorge* und *Divini Redemptoris*, sowie der Enzyklika *Summi Pontificatus*, mit der er am 20. Oktober 1939 sein Pontifikat einleitete und in der er die Themen der beiden erstgenannten Enzykliken wieder aufgriff. Alle Reden verurteilen gleichzeitig sowohl Nationalsozialismus als auch Kommunismus als „Feinde Gottes“. Alle nehmen davon Abstand, in den Streit der Kriegführenden einzugreifen. Alle verurteilen „die Grausamkeiten des Krieges, von welcher Seite sie auch begangen sein mögen“. Alle verkünden im Namen des „Heils der christlichen Kultur“ die Notwendigkeit der „Rückkehr zu den Grundsätzen der Gerechtigkeit und des wahrhaften Friedens“.

Die deutschen Botschafter beim Vatikan, die mit Befriedigung feststellten, daß Pius XII. sich niemals bereit fand, Deutschland allein zu verurteilen — ebensowenig wie er jemals eine einseitige Verurteilung der Angelsachsen aussprach —, interpretierten diese Ausdrucksweise jedesmal als einen Sympathiebeweis für Deutschland, der ihrem persönlichen Wirken zuzuschreiben sei. Und Friedländer folgte ihnen hierin jedesmal getreulich auf dem Fuße, indem er präziserte, daß diese Sympathie nicht nur einem Deutschland im allgemeinen, sondern einem Deutschland gegolten habe, das,

¹¹⁸ Giovannetti, *Der Vatikan*, S. 143

weil nationalsozialistisch, ein Bollwerk gegen den Bolschewismus geworden sei. In Wirklichkeit beweist gerade der Tenor der gesamten päpstlichen Ansprachen, wie zum Beispiel der der oben-erwähnten Begrüßungsansprache an den neuen Botschafter Litauens, daß, wenn Pius XII., der Nationalsozialismus und Bolschewismus zugleich als „Feinde Gottes“ und als „Gefahr für die christliche Kultur“ verurteilte, überhaupt irgend etwas fürchtete, dann das, was Weizsäcker in dem einzigen zitierenswerten aller von Friedländer angeführten Dokumente zum Ausdruck brachte, nämlich, daß „Deutschland unter der Wucht des Geschehens im Osten sich schließlich doch den Russen in die Arme werfen könnte“, wobei Weizsäcker noch hinzufügte, daß „die Behauptung, die deutsche Regierung und die russische Regierung seien schon miteinander in Fühlung . . . [im Vatikan] unausrottbar [sei]“¹¹⁹.

Es war also die durch Nationalsozialismus und Bolschewismus gemeinsam heraufgeführte Zerrüttung der christlichen Kultur, das heißt, Europas und der gesamten Welt. Und das war nun allerdings eine ebenso begründete Befürchtung des „Stellvertreters Christi“ wie seine Sorge um Krieg und Frieden.

5. Wir werden, namentlich bei der Analyse der Haltung Pius' XII. gegenüber dem Krieg, noch auf einige Argumente Friedländers zurückkommen, die sich auf die Interpretation dieser Haltung beziehen. Einstweilen genügte es, dem Leser eine Vorstellung von der Fragwürdigkeit seiner Grundthese zu vermitteln, nach der Pius XII. das nationalsozialistische Deutschland als ein Bollwerk der Kultur gegen den Bolschewismus betrachtete und demzufolge nichts tat, um es zu schwächen, hingegen alles, um eine Umkehrung der bestehenden Bündnisse zu bewirken. Wie wir noch zeigen werden, ist es offensichtlich, daß er, nachdem es ihm nicht gelungen war, die Welt vor dem Krieg zu bewahren, alles tat, um ihn abzukürzen, und zwar alles ausschließlich mit diesem Ziel. Ein Wort sei an dieser Stelle trotzdem noch hinzugefügt: Wenn Friedländer wirklich glaubt, neue und noch unveröffentlichte Unterlagen beige-steuert zu haben, die zum Verständnis der Ereignisse „dienlich“

¹¹⁹ Telegramm Weizsäckers an Berlin vom 24. September 1943. Zitiert bei Friedländer, *Pius XII.*, S. 136

sein können, dann macht er sich große Illusionen. Denn man brauchte nur Alberto Giovannetti (*Der Vatikan und der Krieg*), Paul Duclos (*Le Vatican et la Seconde Guerre mondiale*), François Charles-Roux (*Huit ans au Vatican*), Camille Cianfarra (*La Guerre et le Vatican*) und Michele Maccarrone (*Il Nationalsocialismo e la Santa Sede*) gelesen zu haben, wo die Dokumente zwar nicht im vollständigen Text, aber doch zumindest dem Inhalt nach und in weitaus objektiverer und genauerer Weise wiedergegeben werden, um nicht nur alles das zu wissen, was in dem uns von Friedländer vorgelegten Material ausgesagt wird, sondern noch weitaus mehr.

VI. DIE VERTEIDIGUNG

Von Ausnahmen abgesehen, war die Verteidigung in dieser Polemik weder haltvoller noch brillanter als die Anklage. Der Grund hierfür ist folgender: Da sie in ihrer Gesamtheit von dem Verhalten Pius' XII. nahezu überhaupt nichts begriffen hatte (und selbst, wenn einmal das Gegenteil der Fall war), verfügte sie weder über einen Kampfplatz noch über Munition und mußte es sich daher gefallen lassen, auf den sorgfältig vorbereiteten Kampfplatz geführt zu werden, den die Anklage für ihre Niederlage ausgewählt hatte. So stand sie da, im offenen Gelände und ohne Waffen, zum Kampf gegen einen sicher verschanzten und bis an die Zähne bewaffneten Gegner — der überdies das Verhalten Pius' XII., das moralisch so tödlich für ihn war, sehr wohl verstanden hatte. Kurz, der gute Glaube ohne die notwendige Sachkenntnis gegen die wohlvorbereitete Böswilligkeit.

Allerdings hatte Pius XII., als er starb, seinen geistlichen Erben eine Art Festung von Leitgedanken hinterlassen und durch die Weiterverfolgung des von Leo XIII., Pius X., Benedikt XV. und Pius XI. eingeschlagenen Weges persönlich nicht wenig dazu beigetragen, sie gleichsam uneinnehmbar zu machen: Noch niemals, ob man nun Bedauern oder Freude darüber empfindet, hatte die römische Kirche eine solche Ausstrahlungskraft erreicht. Sie verdankte dies in gleichem Maße einer bis ins Äußerste gesteigerten Empfindsamkeit für die Probleme der menschlichen Existenz, von der sie seit Leo XIII. unablässig Zeugnis abgelegt hatte, wie auch auf

dem Gebiet der internationalen Beziehungen einer Politik der Versöhnung, die sie seit Pius X. im Lichte eines unerschütterlichen Dienstes für den Frieden erscheinen ließ. Als Johannes XXIII. im Jahre 1958 sein Pontifikat antrat, trugen die Völker in Erinnerung, daß es Pius X. selbst mit übermenschlichen Anstrengungen nicht vermocht hatte, den Ausbruch des Ersten Weltkrieges zu verhindern, daß es Benedikt XV. nicht gelungen war, die zwischenstaatlichen Beziehungen in den Jahren 1916/17 wiederherzustellen, und daß er, nachdem man ihn vom Abschluß des Versailler Vertrages ferngehalten hatte, an der Abfassung dieses Textes, der den Grund zum Zweiten Weltkrieg legte, in keiner Weise teilgenommen hatte, daß Pius XI. und Pius XII. niemals aufgehört hatten, im Hinblick auf die Gerechtigkeit unter den Völkern in der allerdiskretesten Weise eine Revision dieses Vertragswerkes nahezulegen, und daß es Pius XII. weder gelungen war, den Ausbruch des Zweiten Weltkrieges und seine spätere Ausbreitung über die gesamte Erde zu verhindern, noch ihn abzukürzen. Kurz, zu der großen Aufgeschlossenheit der Kirche gegenüber den sozialen Problemen kam beim Tode Pius' XII. noch die Tatsache hinzu, daß die römische Kirche unter den Mächten, die die Welt regieren, die einzige war, der man weder am einen noch am anderen der beiden Weltkriege irgendwelche Verantwortung beimessen konnte. Und im Falle des Zweiten Weltkrieges kam das ganze Verdienst für diese Nichtverantwortlichkeit, den Glanz, der dadurch auf die Kirche zurückfiel, und den Gewinn, den sie daraus zog, Pius XII. zu. Zu einem pronazistischen Papst wurde er dennoch in den Augen derjenigen, die, nachdem sie Hitler in Deutschland zur Macht verholfen hatten (und Pius XII. gehörte nicht zu ihnen, nicht im entferntesten), anschließend kein anderes Mittel als den Krieg sahen, um ihn wieder von dort zu vertreiben. (Man darf sich sogar fragen, ob sie nicht Hitler an die Macht brachten, um Gelegenheit zu erhalten, gegen Deutschland Krieg zu führen und es noch vollständiger zu zerschmettern als in Versailles.) Ebenso sahen ihn die konkurrierenden religiösen Gemeinschaften, insbesondere die protestantischen und die jüdischen, genauso wie (aus den gleichen Gründen) Benedikt XV. in den Augen Clemenceaus zu einem „Papst der Deutschen“ geworden war.

Hier lag das ganze Problem von Hochhuths *Stellvertreter*. Aus jenen Höhen, in die sich Pius XII. offenbar mühelos emporgeschwungen hatte und von denen aus er über Krieg und Frieden so häufig Äußerungen tat, die ihn als einen wahren Stellvertreter Christi¹²⁰ auswiesen und die zweifellos eines Tages wie „Bergpredigten“ anmuten werden, ließen sich seine Verteidiger in eine Auseinandersetzung hineinziehen, in der es nicht um die Kriegsgreuel an sich ging, was noch nicht einmal einen solchen Abstieg bedeutet hätte, sondern einzig und allein um die Nazi-Greuel, und zwar nur, soweit die Juden davon betroffen waren. Als ob ein Krieg nur grausam wäre und nicht vor allem Fragen der Gerechtigkeit aufwürfe. Als ob es Kriege ohne Grausamkeiten *beiderseits* der Feuerlinie geben könnte. Als ob die Genfer und Haager Konventionen etwas anderes wären als eine Kriegslist, mit der diejenigen, die die Fäden des Spiels in den Händen halten, die Masse der Gutgläubigen überzeugen wollen, daß es Möglichkeiten gäbe, den Krieg zu humanisieren, und daß daher die Frage einer Ächtung des Krieges belanglos sei. Als ob schließlich die nichtjüdischen Opfer unter den fünfzig Millionen Toten des Zweiten Weltkrieges, deren Anzahl zehn- bis zwanzigmal so groß ist wie die der Juden und die unter ganz genauso grausamen Umständen ums Leben kamen — selbst unter dem Feuer der Alliierten! —, nicht im geringsten interessierten.

Wie um alles in der Welt konnte ein solcher Sturz überhaupt geschehen? Im Grunde ist die Antwort ziemlich einfach, und da man die Wahrheit gelegentlich sogar seinen Freunden verdankt, werden die Verteidiger Pius' XII. es mir verzeihen, daß ich sie

¹²⁰ Die Erfahrung scheint zu lehren, daß die Sprache eines Stellvertreters Christi dem gesunden Menschenverstand nicht ohne weiteres eingeht. Das Beispiel dafür wurde uns soeben von Papst Paul VI. geliefert, der sichtlich den Spuren Pius' XII. folgt, obwohl der Strom, gegen den er anschwimmen muß, unleugbar die Kraft eines Wildwassers besitzt. Als er am 6. Januar 1965 das diplomatische Korps empfing, das gekommen war, um ihm seine Neujahrswünsche zu entbieten, sprach Paul VI. in seiner Antwort an den Doyen über das Thema des Friedens, und nachdem er das Problem der Entwicklungsländer angeführt hatte, schloß er seine Ausführungen mit der Erwähnung der „geistigen und sittlichen Grundsätze, auf denen sich die Zivilisation von morgen aufbauen kann“. Am Tage nach dieser Rede gab *Le Figaro* seinem Artikel mit Recht die Überschrift „Neuer Friedensappell Pauls VI.“: „Papst Paul VI.

ihnen so unverblümt sage, wie es meine Art ist: In den finsternen Stunden des Jahres 1939, von April bis September, als dieser frisch-gewählte Papst seine ganze Kraft aufbot, um den künftigen Alliierten in dem Krieg gegen Deutschland zu beweisen, daß sämtliche europäische Probleme noch durch Verhandlungen nach Art derjenigen, die in München im vorhergegangenen September so erfolgreich verlaufen war, und gemäß den Grundsätzen der Gerechtigkeit geregelt werden könnten, waren die meisten von ihnen, obwohl sie in Pius XII. zugleich den Menschen und das Amt verehrten, bereits davon überzeugt, daß es keine andere Möglichkeit mehr gab, mit Hitler „Schluß zu machen“, als zur tätlichen Auseinandersetzung zu schreiten. Im Jahre 1963 jetzt das Problem auf das Terrain zu tragen, auf dem Pius XII. gestanden hatte, bedeutete für jene anzuerkennen, daß sie dem Hirten nicht gefolgt waren und daß sie sich getäuscht hatten. Nun, das ist menschlich; man gibt nicht leicht zu, daß man sich geirrt hat, selbst die Heiligen tun es nicht gerne. Die ganze Vergangenheit der Menschheit ist immer noch so im Bewußtsein verankert, daß man es den Leuten nicht leicht klarmachen kann, daß der Krieg stets vermeidbar ist: Ein großer Teil derjenigen, die der *Stellvertreter* vor den Kopf stieß und in die Schranken forderte, um das Andenken Pius' XII. zu verteidigen, die in allerbestem Glauben für ihn eintraten und dabei nicht einmal gewahr wurden, daß sie mit seinem Denken nichts gemein haben, ist trotz der fünfzig Millionen Toten, trotz der Milliarden und aber Milliarden von Schäden, trotz eines Friedens, der *nach* dem letzten Kriege unsicherer ist als *vorher*, überzeugt, daß dieser Krieg doch sehr vorteilhafte Ergebnisse hatte und daß

erließ heute morgen, als er die beim Vatikan akkreditierten Mitglieder des diplomatischen Korps, die gekommen waren, um ihm ihre Glückwünsche zum Jahreswechsel zu entbieten, in Audienz empfing, einen neuen Aufruf zum Frieden. Der Papst verbarg nicht seine Besorgnis über die gegenwärtige Situation. Obgleich er keine der derzeitigen Krisen erwähnte, ist es klar, daß er auf die Ereignisse in Vietnam und im Kongo sowie auf den Streit zwischen Indonesien und Malaysia anspielte. Paul VI. wies ebenfalls erneut auf die Notwendigkeit der Zusammenarbeit zwischen den Nationen und der Hilfe für die noch in der Entwicklung befindlichen Völker hin.“

Doch am gleichen Tage erschien in *Le Monde* die Überschrift: „Paul VI. weist anläßlich des Empfanges des diplomatischen Korps auf die Rechte der Entwicklungsländer hin.“

er zweifellos ... Kurz, ich bin bereit, eine Wette einzugehen: Es erscheint nicht zweifelhaft, daß, wenn das Verhältnis zwischen Ost und West sich so weit verschlechterte wie 1939 zwischen den angelsächsischen Mächten und Deutschland, Paul VI. an beide Seiten die gleiche Sprache richten würde wie sein Vorgänger und daß man ihm ebensowenig Gehör schenken oder folgen würde. Daraus resultiert, daß nach jenem nächsten Krieg die Verteidiger eines in gleicher Weise angeklagten Paul VI. sich in eben der gleichen Weise in Verlegenheit gebracht fühlen würden.

Für die Verteidiger Pius' XII. — hier brauchen wir uns nicht mit Hypothesen auseinanderzusetzen, da wir über eine Fülle von Fakten verfügen — gibt es zwar vielleicht eine Entschuldigung: Seine erste Enzyklika, *Summi Pontificatus*, wurde erst am 20. Oktober 1939 veröffentlicht, zu einem Zeitpunkt also, an dem das Unheil bereits geschehen war. Schwerer wiegt jedoch die Tatsache, daß dieses Unheil durchaus noch wieder gutzumachen gewesen wäre. Er sagte zu ihnen: „Da heißt es nicht mehr Heide oder Jude ...“ und weiter beschwörend: „Ehrwürdige Brüder, die Stunde, in der dieses Unser erstes Rundschreiben zu euch hinausgeht, ist in mehr als einer Hinsicht wahrhaft eine *Stunde der Finsternis* (Luk. 22, 53) ...“ und „Schon sind Völker in den mörderischen Strudel des Krieges hineingezogen, und vielleicht stehen sie erst am *Anfang der Leiden* (Matth. 24, 8); und doch sind bereits in Tausenden von Familien Tod ... , Trauer und Elend bitterer Hausgast geworden. Das Blut ungezählter Menschen, auch von Nichtkämpfern, erhebt erschütternde Klage, ...¹²¹.“ Aber sie hörten nicht auf ihn, auch nicht im folgenden Jahr, als er von Juli bis Oktober versuchte, die Brücken zwischen den Kriegführenden wiederherzustellen.

Zu jener Zeit war ihr Papst nicht mehr Pius XII., sondern der klägliche Churchill, und sein Weihbischof der nicht weniger klägliche Roosevelt.

Alles in allem waren die Verteidiger Pius' XII. wegen ihrer früheren Einstellung zum Kriege ebenso gehemmt, wie seine Ankläger aus entgegengesetzten Gründen darauf versessen waren, die

¹²¹ Zitiert nach Papst Pius XII., *Reden und Enzykliken*, hg. von P. Wilhelm Jussen. Hamburg 1946. S. 151 und 172. (Anm. d. Übers.)

ihre zu rechtfertigen, und darum vermied man es auf beiden Seiten, dem Problem auf den Grund zu gehen.

Die Verteidiger Pius' XII. hatten seine Leitidee, die Idee von der Verteidigung des Friedens, nicht verstanden oder nicht aufgegriffen. Deshalb blieb ihnen als Argument nur die Beweisführung, daß der Papst nahezu nichts von den nazistischen Greueln gewußt und, wann immer er davon Kenntnis erhielt, dagegen protestiert habe, soweit es ihm irgend möglich war, wobei die Grenze seines Handelns nur von der Sorge bestimmt gewesen sei, das Los der Betroffenen nicht zu verschlimmern.

Auf diesem Gebiet konnten sie angesichts gewissenloser Gegner, deren redlichstes Argument noch die Heranziehung der Texte war, nur die Unterlegenen sein. Infolgedessen hatten die Gegner Pius' XII. leichtes Spiel mit der Behauptung, daß er niemals aufgehört habe, dem nationalsozialistischen Deutschland seine Sympathie zu bekunden, und daß er sich nur auf Grund dieser Sympathie im Jahre 1939 gegen den Krieg ausgesprochen habe und keinesfalls aus Pazifismus, was seine Friedensbemühungen unlauter erscheinen lasse.

Die Kriegstreiber sind einfallslos: 1914 hatten die Vorfahren der Kriegshetzer von 1939 dieses Verfahren bereits gegen Pius X. angewendet, dessen Bemühungen um den Frieden von ihnen als ein ausschließlicher Sympathiebeweis für Franz Joseph ausgelegt wurden (weil dieser im Jahre 1930 seine Wahl zum Papst begünstigt hatte, indem er sich derjenigen des Kardinals Rampolla widersetzte), und 1917 gegen Benedikt XV. (den „Papst der Deutschen“ Clemenceaus). Doch die Verteidiger Pius' XII. ließen sich auf das Thema der nazistischen Greuel festnageln und begaben sich damit der Möglichkeit, von diesem Argument Gebrauch zu machen. Und mit dem Hinweis auf ihren Papst, der nichts davon gewußt oder der, soweit er davon gewußt habe, sich nicht anders habe verhalten können, wenn er nicht das Schlimmste heraufbeschwören wollte, führten sie keinen stärkeren Gegenschlag, als wenn sie mit Pfeilen auf Atombomben geantwortet hätten.

Es soll hier noch einmal gesagt werden: Es ist wahr, daß Pius XII. nichts gewußt hat. Doch da dies nicht das Problem darstellte, war es ein sehr dürftiges Argument. Es ist ebenfalls wahr, daß er stets

bemüht war, das Schlimmste zu vermeiden, und daß darin der Grund für seine „Zurückhaltung“ — das Wort stammt von ihm selbst — lag, doch machte man ihm gerade das zum Vorwurf. Alfred Grosser¹²², Mentor Saul Friedländers, ging sogar so weit, zu sagen: „Man muß zuweilen den Mut haben, das Notwendige dem Nützlichen vorzuziehen.“ In den Augen der Feinde Pius' XII. hat dieses Wort, das sie wohlweislich nicht in seinem richtigen Zusammenhang wiedergeben, den Charakter eines Geständnisses. Die „Zurückhaltung“ des Papstes erklärt sich aus der Sorge, das über die Menschheit hereingebrochene Unheil nicht noch zu verschlimmern, sowie aus der Sorge, der Vater aller Menschen zu bleiben. In diesem Falle bedeutete der Spielraum zwischen dem „Nützlichen“ und dem „Notwendigen“ zweifellos soviel wie zu entscheiden, ob er die ungefähr 40 bis 50 Millionen Katholiken in den von den deutschen Truppen besetzten Gebieten Europas den Repressalien Hitlers ausliefern sollte oder nicht, ohne dadurch das Los der Juden in irgendeiner Weise, wenn nicht zum Schlechteren, zu ändern. Er hätte sich auch zur völligen Stummheit verdammt: Um des Papstes Stimme unhörbar zu machen, brauchte Mussolini lediglich den *Osservatore Romano* zu verbieten und Radio Vatikan den elektrischen Strom zu entziehen¹²³. Woraus man sieht, daß es nicht einmal nötig gewesen wäre, ihn zu deportieren: Durch Weizsäcker wissen wir, daß dies erwogen wurde. Wir wissen aber auch¹²⁴, daß Pius XII. eine solche Eventualität keineswegs fürchtete, wie von jedermann, einschließlich seiner Ankläger, zugegeben wird, obwohl sie versuchten, ihm diese Furcht zu unterstellen. Es hätte ferner bedeutet, sich der Möglichkeit jeglicher späterer Bemühung zu berauben, und zwar sowohl zugunsten der Juden selbst — von denen er manch einen rettete¹²⁵! — als auch hinsichtlich der Wiederherstellung der internationalen Beziehungen, auf die er weiterhin hoffte. Sich deportieren oder unter Ausschluß jeder Verbindung mit der Außenwelt im Vatikan einschließen zu lassen, hätte geheißen, das Steuer des „Schiffes Petri“ fah-

¹²² Radiosendung vom 27. November 1964 über *Pius XII. und das Dritte Reich*.

¹²³ Ein solcher Plan bestand. Vgl. Duclos, *Le Vatican*, S. 123

¹²⁴ Dino Alfieri, *Deux dictateurs face à face*, S. 30, zitiert bei Friedländer, *Pius XII.*, S. 47

ren und dieses mit seinen an die 500 Millionen Passagieren auf den stürmischen Ozean einer dem Wahnsinn verfallenen Welt hinaus-treiben zu lassen . . .

Es mag noch hingehen, daß Alfred Grosser, obgleich Professor an der *École des Hautes Études* in Paris, sich nicht darüber im klaren ist, daß er sich mit seiner Formel von der Entscheidung zugunsten des „Notwendigen“ anstelle des „Nützlichen“ zugleich lächerlich und verabscheuenswürdig macht. Lächerlich deshalb, weil er einen Papst zur Abdankung auffordert, und verabscheuenswürdig, weil man, selbst ohne Hoffnung auf Rettung der Juden, trotzdem 40 bis 50 Millionen Katholiken hätte opfern müssen. Bei derartigen Leuten muß man auf alles gefaßt sein. Doch das Folgende übersteigt das Begriffsvermögen: Die Verteidiger Pius' XII. haben noch nicht einmal bemerkt, daß der merkwürdige Jesuit Riccardo des Herrn Rolf Hochhuth durch sein Verständnis dafür, daß Gerstein vor der Öffentlichkeit schweigt, um nicht seine Familie den Repressalien der Gestapo auszusetzen¹²⁶, die Benutzung dieses Argumentes völlig unmöglich machte. Ganz zu schweigen von der Anmaßung, daß das Leben jener zwei Dutzend deutscher Prote-

¹²⁵ Zwei moralisch und finanziell durch den Vatikan unterstützte kirchliche Organisationen waren den Juden, die sich mit ihnen in Verbindung setzen konnten, behilflich, Italien zu verlassen, indem sie ihnen Geld und ausländische Pässe besorgten. Es handelt sich hierbei um die Organisationen *Oeuvre de Saint-Raphael* und *Delasem*, die übrigens direkt mit den jüdischen Organisationen der Vereinigten Staaten zusammenarbeiteten. Darüber hinaus wurden den Juden die römischen Klöster als Zufluchtsstätten geöffnet. (Vgl. Pater Leiber, *Stimmen der Zeit*, März 1961.)

¹²⁶ Vgl. Hochhuth, *Stellvertreter*, S. 69. Als Riccardo von Gerstein verlangt, er solle nach London gehen und dort über BBC von allem berichten, was er wußte, entgegnet Gerstein „leidenschaftlich“: „Herrgott — *ahnen* Sie nur, was Sie da verlangen: Ich tue alles — aber dies *kann* ich nicht tun. Eine Rede von mir am Radio London — und in Deutschland wird meine Familie ausgerottet.“

Hierauf Riccardo: „O bitte, das — das habe ich nicht gewußt!“

Der Dialog geht folgendermaßen weiter: Gerstein: „Die würden nicht nur meine Frau ermorden, meine Kinder — noch meine Brüder würden sie im Lager zu Tode quälen.“

Und Riccardo bittet demütig: „Verzeihn Sie mir . . .“

Aber es versteht sich von selbst, daß Pius XII. ein „Verbrecher“ ist, weil er für 40 bis 50 Millionen Katholiken die gleiche Sorge hegte.

stanten, die den Namen Gerstein tragen, für die Zukunft der Welt wertvoller sei als das von 40 bis 50 Millionen Katholiken!

Ich weiß wohl, was die Verteidiger Pius' XII. am meisten zurückhielt, die Debatte zu eröffnen: Wurde sie nämlich in ihrem tatsächlichen Ausmaß geführt, so mußte sie zwangsläufig auf die Frage der Verantwortung für den Zweiten Weltkrieg hinauslaufen. Das zentrale Thema dieser Auseinandersetzung wäre in diesem Fall jener Standpunkt geworden, der in einer Information des deutschen Geheimdienstes formuliert wurde und der die Haltung des Papstes vor dem Kriege wie auch während des ganzen Krieges erklärt: „Der Papst nimmt ... eine ganz klare Haltung im Streit der beiden kämpfenden Parteien ein; er verurteilt den Angriff Deutschlands und seine antikatholische Politik, aber mißbilligt gleichzeitig auch die Bestrebungen der reichen Völker England und Frankreich, die nicht bereit waren, einen Teil der von ihnen zufällig erworbenen kolonialen Reichtümer den verarmten Völkern Deutschland und Italien zu überlassen¹²⁷ ... “ Mit anderen Worten: Er verurteilte den Versailler Vertrag. Dazu gehört auch — wenn man das Andenken Pius' XII. verteidigen wollte — die rühmende Hervorhebung seiner wiederholten Stellungnahmen für die Notwendigkeit, diesen Vertrag den Geboten der Gerechtigkeit unter den Völkern anzupassen, da nur durch seine Revision der Krieg vermieden werden könne. Dazu gehören ferner seine Stellungnahmen gegen die britische und französische Kriegserklärung an Deutschland und, nach Kriegsausbruch, gegen die Ausweitung des Konfliktes, ganz gleich, ob sie nun von Mussolini, Churchill oder Roosevelt verursacht wurde. Er war einzig und allein besorgt, die „ersehnte Stunde einer Auferstehung nach den Grundsätzen der Gerechtigkeit und eines wahren Friedens¹²⁸“ zurückkehren zu sehen. Zum Verständnis der geschichtlichen Rolle des Papstes ge-

¹²⁷ Inf. III vom 18. 7. 1941, Archiv AA, StS: V. Zitiert bei Friedländer, *Pius XII.*, S. 68

¹²⁸ *Summi Pontificatus* (Zitiert nach *Der Papst an die Deutschen, Pius XII. als Apostolischer Nuntius und als Papst in seinen deutschsprachigen Reden und Sendschreiben von 1917 bis 1956*, hg. von B. Wuestenberg und J. Zabkar. Frankfurt am Main 1956. S. 94 — Anm. d. Übers.). Das Thema wurde in allen Weihnachtsbotschaften während des Krieges und in allen Ansprachen vom 2. Juni vor dem Kardinalskollegium wiederaufgenommen.

hört auch, daß er zugleich den „Angriff Deutschlands“ und die „Bestrebungen der reichen Völker England und Frankreich“ verurteilte, wie aus dem oben zitierten Text deutlich hervorgeht. Dies brachte die Verteidiger Pius' XII. ganz besonders in Verlegenheit, denn es bedeutet die Verwerfung jener heutzutage so beliebten These von der einseitigen Verantwortlichkeit Deutschlands oder gar Hitlers an der Entfesselung des Zweiten Weltkrieges — sie hat durch den Prozeß gegen die Hauptkriegsverbrecher in Nürnberg Gesetzeskraft erlangt — zugunsten der These der geteilten Verantwortlichkeiten. An dieser Stelle fürchteten die Verteidiger Pius' XII., der Sympathie für den Nationalsozialismus oder des Neonazismus bezichtigt zu werden. (Ich spreche dabei nicht von Dummköpfen vom Typ des Pater Riquet, die 1939 aus übrigens wenig edlen Gründen bedingungslose Kriegshetzer waren und sich voller Bewunderung für das, was sie gewesen waren und sich rühmen, geblieben zu sein, nun unablässig im Spiegel betrachten.) Dies habe, wie sie nicht zu Unrecht sagten, unter den gegenwärtigen Umständen und obwohl viele Leute hinsichtlich der meisten „Propagandawahrheiten“ über die „Alleinschuld Deutschlands am Kriege“, mit denen man sie förmlich überschüttet habe, ihre Meinung geändert hätten, alle Aussicht, in der Öffentlichkeit vollen Glauben zu finden. Nicht daß sie Feiglinge wären — nein, aus taktischen Gründen. „Da wir ihnen so keinerlei Anlaß geboten haben, uns in den Schmutz zu ziehen“, erklärte mir einer von ihnen, und zwar kein unbedeutender, „ist unser Ansehen für den wahren Kampf unversehrt geblieben. Es ist uns klar, daß wir die Schlacht, wenn die Stunde gekommen ist, auf diesem Gebiet werden schlagen müssen . . . “ So oder fast so lauteten seine Worte. Ich beschränkte mich auf die Erwiderung, daß es besser gewesen wäre, das Ansehen des Papstes unversehrt zu lassen. Und zwar nicht, weil er Papst war, ergänzte ich — denn ich bin Atheist und deshalb daran nicht im geringsten interessiert —, sondern weil er Pazifist war und weil daher in seiner Person nicht nur alle Katholiken, sondern auch alle Pazifisten verletzt worden waren, und dies ist es wohl wert, ins Wasser zu springen, um sein Andenken zu retten. Ohne jedes Risiko übrigens, setzte ich erläuternd hinzu, da sich hier in diesem Wasser eine unversenkbare Boje in der Gestalt der

geschichtlichen Wahrheit befindet. Und die Meinung der Schwachköpfe, durch die man Gefahr läuft, unpopulär zu werden. Im Dienste der geschichtlichen Wahrheit ist die Unpopularität stets nur augenblicklich: „Die triumphierende Lüge, die vergeht“, sagte Jaurès. *Die vergeht!* Und unter diesem Gesichtspunkt gesehen — wie viele Vorteile bietet nicht demgegenüber das für den Augenblick abgegebene Zeugnis?

Alle diese Überlegungen, die darauf abzielten, das wirkliche Ausmaß des Problems festzustellen, machen es unnötig, auf die Argumente der Verteidigung im einzelnen einzugehen. So ist es zum Beispiel unwesentlich, anzumerken, daß man durch den Versuch, die Aufführungen des *Stellvertreter* durch Demonstrationen am Theatereingang oder durch Werfen von Stinkbomben im Theater zu verhindern, nichts weiter zu erreichen vermochte, als Rémy Roure die Gelegenheit zu geben, mit der Entgegnung „Stinkbomben sind keine Antwort auf die Frage¹²⁹“ einen mühelosen Erfolg für sich zu verbuchen.

Und wenn Pater Riquet uns sagt, daß Pius XII. am 18. März 1945 einen Friedensappell erlassen und an alle, die seinerzeit mitgerissen worden waren, die inständige Bitte gerichtet habe, „dem Götzendienst des absoluten Nationalismus, dem Hochmut der Rasse und des Blutes sowie dem Verlangen nach Hegemonie“ zu entsagen, und Himmler als Antwort darauf den Lagerkommandanten eine Mitteilung gesandt habe, in der es hieß: „Kein Häftling darf dem Feind lebend in die Hände fallen, alle sind zu liquidieren¹³⁰, so kann man ihn nur darauf aufmerksam machen, daß Himmler niemals eine solche Mitteilung geschickt hat¹³¹. Man stellt nicht einer Lüge eine andere entgegen, denn Lügen sind keine Nägel, bei denen man den einen mit einem anderen austreiben kann. Und was ihn selbst betrifft, kann man nur fragen: Riquet oder Loriguet^{131a}? Kurz, Pater Riquet erwies der Verteidigung Pius' XII. damit einen Bären dienst.

¹²⁹ *Le Figaro* v. 28. Dezember 1963

¹³⁰ *Le Figaro* v. 3. Januar 1964

¹³¹ *Le Figaro littéraire* v. 4. Juni 1960, unter dem Namen von Jacques Sabille, sowie *Les Mains du miracle* von Joseph Kessel, der sich dabei auf den Leibarzt Himmlers, Dr. Kersten, beruft.

Und wenn schließlich die deutsche Bundesregierung „unter tiefem Bedauern über die Angriffe gegen Pius XII.“ verkündet, sie „wisse, wie sehr sie dem Papst für seine Hilfe zu Dank verpflichtet sei, die er dem deutschen Volke beim Zusammenbruch des Nazi-regimes zugunsten der Aussöhnung Deutschlands mit den anderen Ländern habe angedeihen lassen¹³²“, so ist das lediglich eine Dankbarkeitsbezeugung ohne historischen Wert und für die Verteidigung Pius' XII. ein weiterer Bärendienst.

Selbst der so häufig zitierte Brief, den Paul VI., damals noch Kardinal Montini, an die englische katholische Zeitschrift *The Tablet*¹³³ richtete, streift das wirkliche Problem nur:

„Eine Verurteilung und ein Protest vor aller Welt, den nicht ausgesprochen zu haben man dem Papst vorwirft, wären nicht nur unnütz, sondern sogar schädlich gewesen ... Gesetzt den Fall, Pius XII. hätte das getan, was ihm Hochhuth vorwirft, nicht getan zu haben, dann hätte das zu derartigen Repressalien und Zerstörungen geführt, daß der gleiche Hochhuth ... nach Kriegsende ein anderes Drama hätte schreiben können, viel realistischer und viel interessanter als jenes, das er ... in Szene gesetzt hat, nämlich das Drama des ‚Stellvertreters‘, dem wegen politischem Exhibitionismus oder psychologischer Unachtsamkeit die Schuld zufallen würde, in der schon so sehr gequälten Welt eine noch viel weitere Zerstörung ausgelöst zu haben, weniger zum eigenen Schaden als zum Schaden unzähliger unschuldiger Opfer¹³⁴.“

Trotzdem muß man gelten lassen, daß dieser Text, wenn er das wahre Problem auch nur streift, es doch gleichwohl stellt, insbesondere in seinem letzten Satz: Jedermann versteht, daß es hier um den Charakter geht, den der Krieg in der Steigerung von Re-

^{131a} *Jean Lorique*t, französischer Jesuit (1767–1845), Verfasser historischer Werke, in denen er die historischen Fakten völlig verfälschte. So nannte er z. B. Napoleon I. den „Marquis Bonaparte, lieutenant des armées de Louis XVIII“. Er wurde zum Gespött der französischen Historiker. Seitdem bezeichnet man einen Historiker, der es mit der geschichtlichen Wahrheit nicht genau nimmt, als einen „Lorique“t. (Erläuterung d. Verf. für die deutsche Ausgabe)

¹³² *Osservatore Romano* v. 5. Mai 1963

¹³³ 11. Mai 1963

¹³⁴ Zitiert nach Adolph, *Verfälschte Geschichte*, S. 112. (Anm. d. Übers.)

pressalie zu Repressalie auf beiden Seiten angenommen hätte, und daß Pius XII. statt des beschwichtigenden Elementes, das er stets sein wollte, zu einem Element der Aufreizung geworden wäre.

Die beste Darlegung des Problems und folglich die beste Antwort auf die Verleumdungskampagne gegen Pius XII. erfolgte durch die deutschen Bischöfe anlässlich der Plenarkonferenz in Hofheim/Taunus vom 4. bis 6. März 1963:

„Papst Pius XII. erfüllte seine Aufgabe als oberster Hirte der Kirche mit bewunderungswürdiger Verantwortung und Gerechtigkeit in einer Zeit, die durch den Zweiten Weltkrieg und das in vielen Völkern sich daran anschließende Chaos besonders schwierig und spannungsreich war.

So erinnern wir uns in Dankbarkeit, daß sich Papst Pius XII. mit aller Kraft bemüht hat, den Ausbruch des Krieges zu verhindern, und daß er während des Krieges alles tat, um dem Blutvergießen unter den Völkern ein Ende zu setzen.

In hervorragendem Maß gehört diesem Papst der Dank der Menschheit, daß er seine Stimme gegen furchtbare Unmenschlichkeiten, insbesondere gegen die Unterdrückung und Vernichtung von Menschen und Völkern erhob, wie sie während des Krieges und nach dem Kriege erfolgten. Wenn die Stimme Pius XII. bei den Verantwortlichen kein Gehör fand, so fällt die Schuld auf sie zurück¹³⁵.“

Leider blieb diese Darstellung ohne Echo. Niemand unterzog sich der Aufgabe zu beweisen, daß sich Pius XII. „mit aller Kraft

¹³⁵ *Katholische Nachrichten Agentur, Informationsdienst*, vom 7. März 1963. Der Objektivität halber muß gesagt werden, daß einer der Konferenzteilnehmer, der Erzbischof von München, Msgr. Döpfner, sich am 8. März 1964 in einer langen Ansprache davon distanzierte und einräumte:

„Es ist im Urteil historischer Rückschau durchaus die Meinung denkbar, daß Pius XII. hätte schärfer protestieren sollen.“ Hierbei wird nur auf die Verbrechen des Nationalsozialismus angespielt, wie aus dem Textzusammenhang klar hervorgeht. Und die einzige Milderung hierzu, die im Grunde gar keine ist: „Jedenfalls dürfte die absolute Lauterkeit seiner Motive und auch die echte Angemessenheit seiner Gründe nicht angezweifelt werden.“

Jacques Nobécourt machte sich eilends daran, den ersten dieser beiden Sätze seinem Buch *Le Vicaire et l'histoire* als Motto voranzustellen und ihn so zu den Anklageakten zu nehmen. Wirklich sehr ärgerlich für den Erzbischof!

bemüht hat, den Ausbruch des Krieges zu verhindern, und daß er während des Krieges alles tat, um dem Blutvergießen unter den Völkern ein Ende zu setzen“.

Und daß dies der wahre Grund war, weshalb man ihn in so gehässiger Weise angegriffen hat.

Das wird im folgenden unsere Aufgabe sein.

Im Anhang¹³⁶ haben wir die wichtigsten anderen Argumente der Verteidigung aufgeführt, angesichts ihrer geringen Bedeutung jedoch lediglich als Notiz.

¹³⁶ Anhang III

Kapitel II

Das eigentliche Problem

I. DIE PÄPSTE UND DER FRIEDEN

Am 20. September 1870 kapitulierte die von den Truppen Viktor Emanuels belagerte Stadt Rom. Dieses Datum steht für die endgültige Verwirklichung der italienischen Einheit¹³⁷ und zugleich auch für das Ende der weltlichen Macht der Päpste.

Es ist eine Scheidelinie zwischen zwei Kirchen und zwischen zwei Epochen.

Zwischen zwei Kirchen aus folgenden Gründen:

Vor dem zum ersten Mal¹³⁸ vollständig versammelten italienischen Parlament konnte Viktor Emmanuel am 5. Dezember 1870 ausrufen: „Italien ist frei und einig. Unsere Aufgabe ist es von nun an, es groß und glücklich zu machen!“ Derartige Formulierungen pflegen die Völker leider mit blinder Begeisterung zu erfüllen: Erst später wurde deutlich, was sie wirklich wert waren. Es mußten nun noch die Beziehungen zwischen Staat und Papsttum festgelegt werden. Dies erfolgte einseitig durch das sogenannte Garantiesgesetz, das vom italienischen Parlament am 2. Mai 1871 verabschiedet wurde und folgenden Inhalt hat: „In seinem ersten Teil verkündete das Gesetz die Heiligkeit und Unverletzlichkeit der Person des Papstes, gewährte ihm in Italien die Würde eines Staatsoberhauptes, eine Rente von 3 225 000 Lire, den freien und unveräußerlichen Besitz des Vatikans, des Laterans und Castel Gandolfos, die Unverletzlichkeit seines Aufenthalts und der von ihm einberufenen Konzilien, freien Verkehr mit dem gesamten Episkopat der katholischen Welt, ohne Einmischung der Regierung, sowie in Rom die Verwaltung der zum kirchlichen Bildungswesen gehörenden Akademien, Seminare, Universitäten und höheren Schulen.

Im zweiten Teil verzichtete der Staat auf jeden Anspruch auf die Besetzung der kirchlichen Ämter, die Erteilung des *Exequatur* und

¹³⁷ Viktor Emanuel, der bereits am 14. März 1861 von einem Parlament, das Abgeordnete aus ganz Italien außer aus dem immer noch österreichischen Venetien und dem Kirchenstaat umfaßte, zum König von Italien proklamiert worden war, ist faktisch erst an diesem Tage, nachdem ihm Venetien durch Volksentscheid am 22. Oktober 1866 zugefallen war, Herrscher ganz Italiens.

¹³⁸ In Florenz. Der erste Zusammentritt des Parlamentes in Rom erfolgte erst am 27. November 1871.

des *Placet regium* sowie die Eidesleistung der vom Papst ernannten Bischöfe; andererseits lehnte der Staat es ab, zu kirchlichen Entscheidungen seine Zustimmung auszusprechen. Sie waren in ihren Wirkungen nichtig, wenn sie sich zu den Gesetzen des Staates in Widerspruch befanden. Das war fast gleichbedeutend mit einer freien Kirche in einem freien Staat¹³⁹.“

Damals saß Pius IX. auf dem apostolischen Stuhl. Ohne irgend ein Werturteil über seine Auffassung von seinem apostolischen Auftrag zu fällen, muß festgestellt werden, daß er ein Mensch war, der mit Wehmut auf jene Epoche zurückblickte, in der Europa von sich selbst noch kein anderes Bewußtsein besaß als das, die Christenheit zu verkörpern, und in der Kaiser Karl der Große die weltliche Macht erst aus den Händen eines seiner Vorgänger empfangen hatte und nach Rom zog, um sich durch ihn in seinem Amt weihen zu lassen; in der ein anderer seiner Vorgänger den Kaiser Heinrich IV. nach Canossa kommen ließ; in der unter dem Kaiser Karl V. Europa, das weiterhin die Christenheit verkörperte, noch das Heilige Römische Reich deutscher Nation war — übrigens weitaus „heiliger“ und „römischer“ als „deutsch“. Diese Sehnsucht des Papstes wurde durch die auf dem Wiener Kongreß verkündete Heilige Allianz neu belebt. Pius IX. richtete sein Augenmerk ausschließlich auf Fragen des Glaubens, der, seiner Vorstellung nach, die Welt durch die päpstlichen Bemühungen regieren sollte. Die uns von ihm hinterlassenen Texte beweisen dies zur Genüge: insbesondere das Dogma der Unbefleckten Empfängnis (1854), das Dogma von der Unfehlbarkeit des Papstes (1870) und der Syllabus (1864)¹⁴⁰. Kurz und gut, er war ein Papst, der, gerade weil er einzig und allein sein Augenmerk auf die Probleme des Glaubens richtete,

¹³⁹ Édouard Petit, *L'Italie*, Juli 1929

¹⁴⁰ Das Dogma von der päpstlichen Unfehlbarkeit wurde am 18. Juli 1870 von einem Konzil verkündet, das bereits seit dem 28. Januar 1868 dauerte und am 9. Oktober 1870 infolge des Falls der Stadt Rom vertagt wurde. Das Dogma rief erhebliche Meinungsverschiedenheiten hervor. Einerseits innerhalb der Kirche: Von den 601 Konzilvätern, die am 28. Januar 1868 zum Konzil zusammengetreten waren, hatten 66 aus Opposition gegen die These am Vorabend der Abstimmung Rom verlassen, doch von den 535, die dort blieben, stimmten nur 2 dagegen. Andererseits in der Welt: Österreich kündigte aus Unzufriedenheit darüber das Konkordat von 1855 auf, in Deutsch-

den wirtschaftlichen oder sozialen Fragen der Zeit völlig fremd gegenüberstand und dem es daher auch an politischem Gefühl restlos mangelte: Hochmütig, so sagte man, doch vor allem würdig weigerte er sich, das Garantiesetz anders als unter Zwang anzuerkennen, das heißt, er erkannte es *de facto*, aber nicht *de jure* an, und betrachtete sich im Vatikan, den er von nun an zu verlassen sich weigerte, als ein Gefangener der Mächte des Teufels¹⁴¹.

Die Nachfolger Pius' IX. machten zwar gute Miene zum bösen Spiel, wußten jedoch erheblichen Vorteil aus dieser neuen Situation zu ziehen: Jeglicher weltlichen Macht entkleidet, konnte es ihnen nicht entgehen, daß sie gleichzeitig von allen diesbezüglichen Bindungen befreit waren — insbesondere von der Versuchung des Kompromisses, da sie bei dieser Lage der Dinge nunmehr weder zu gewinnen noch zu verlieren hatten — und daß sie nun im geistigen Bereich ohne Risiko eine feste, bis zur absoluten Unbeugbarkeit gehende Haltung einzunehmen vermochten. Niemals haben Päpste mehr Freiheit besessen, zu sagen, was sie dachten, und es so zu sagen, wie sie es dachten. Größere Freiheit heißt aber größere Kraft. Mit Leo XIII., der im Jahre 1878 die Nachfolge von Pius IX. antrat, begann für die Kirche ein geistiger Aufstieg, der ihr moralisches Ansehen auf eine nie zuvor gekannte Höhe erhob.

Wir verdanken Leo XIII. eine ganze Reihe von Schriften, deren Inhalt sicherlich anfechtbar ist, deren glänzende Form jedoch eine unvergleichliche geistige Beweglichkeit erkennen läßt. Die berühmteste ist die Enzyklika *Rerum novarum* (1891) gegen den Marxismus, doch sind alle anderen, obwohl vergessen, nicht weniger bemerkenswert: die Enzyklika *Immortale Dei* (1883) über die Staatsordnung (sie erregte in Deutschland ein solches Aufsehen, daß der

land bildete es die Ursache für den Kulturkampf, und in der Schweiz führte es zu einer Trennung der Kirche von Rom. Dieses Konzil, das unter der Bezeichnung „Erstes Vatikanisches Konzil“ abgehalten wurde, war das erste seit dem Konzil von Trient (1545—1563). Das von Johannes XXIII. im Jahre 1962 einberufene Zweite Vatikanische Konzil nahm die Diskussion an dem Punkt wieder auf, an dem sie am Ende des Ersten Vatikanischen Konzils abgebrochen worden war, erweiterte sie jedoch auf andere Themen.

¹⁴¹ Die Gefangenschaft der Päpste im Vatikan endete erst im Jahre 1929 mit der Unterzeichnung eines Konkordats zwischen Pius XI. und dem unter Mussolinis Führung stehenden Italien.

Einfluß der Katholiken in der Politik gewaltig wuchs; Bismarck kam plötzlich nicht mehr ohne sie aus, wollte er den Sieg seiner Politik im Reichstag sichern, und mußte, um ihre für ihn unerläßliche Mitwirkung zu erlangen, vor ihnen kapitulieren und die unter dem Zeichen des Kulturkampfes gegen sie verabschiedeten Gesetze aufheben; die Enzyklika *Sapientiae* (1890) über die Pflichten des christlichen Staatsbürgers (sie zeigte eine Politik auf, die später Politik des Ralliement¹⁴² genannte wurde, nachdem sie dem französischen Episkopat durch ein Schreiben (1892) in Erinnerung gerufen worden war, das diesen dazu anhielt, die Gläubigen zur Aufgabe ihrer systematischen Opposition gegen die bestehende Regierungsform zu veranlassen); ferner die Enzyklika *Graves de communi* (1901), eine klare und umfassende Darstellung der christlichen Auffassung von der Gesellschaft, die, in engem geistigen Zusammenhang mit der Enzyklika *Rerum novarum* gesehen, ihm den Ruf des „Arbeiterpapstes“ einbrachte, usw.

Das Pontifikat Pius' X., der im Jahre 1903 die Nachfolge Leos XIII. antrat, war von Anfang an durch ein für die Kirche sehr schwerwiegendes Ereignis in schmerzlicher Weise geprägt, nämlich durch das Gesetz über die Trennung von Kirche und Staat in Frankreich. Dieses Gesetz veranlaßte ihn zu zwei päpstlichen Rundschreiben, mit denen sich ein freier und unabhängiger Mensch nur schwer einverstanden erklären kann, den Enzykliken *Veementer* (11. Februar 1906) und *Gravissimo* (10. August des gleichen Jahres). Sie waren jedoch eine Entgegnung auf gewisse Exzesse in der Konzeption des Gesetzes und seiner Anwendung, die ein freier und unabhängiger Mensch ebensoschwer akzeptieren kann. Nachdem die Zeit, diese große Ausgleicherin der Gegensätze, ihr Werk verrichtet hat, geht heutzutage die Tendenz fast allgemein dahin, in jenen beiden ein wenig über das Ziel hinausschießenden Enzykliken vor allem eine wohlverständliche Abwehrreaktion der Kirche gegenüber dem fanatischen Antiklerikalismus des Väterchen

¹⁴² Unter *Ralliement* versteht man die den französischen Katholiken von Leo XIII. empfohlene politische Mitarbeit in der Republik. Darin inbegriffen ist die Anerkennung der Republik, der Verzicht auf eine Restauration der Monarchie und die Gewinnung der Massen durch soziale Reformen. (Anm. d. Übers.)

Combes zu sehen: Dieser war vornehmlich darum besorgt, die Aufmerksamkeit von den auf sozialen Gebiet erzielten Ergebnissen einer Republik abzulenken, die hier die in sie gesetzten Erwartungen bei weitem nicht erfüllt hatte, und eine gewaltige, von großem Ehrgeiz erfüllte Arbeiterbewegung auf Ziele hinzuleiten, die den wohlhabenden Schichten weniger teuer zu stehen kommen würden. Staat und Kirche sind *de jure* auch heute noch getrennt, doch *de facto* sind die Ordensgesellschaften mit allen ihren Vorrechten zurückgekehrt, die Gemeinden halten die Kirchen instand, der Staat subventioniert die Konfessionsschulen und ... es hat nicht den Anschein, als würde die geistige — und materielle! — Zufriedenheit der Franzosen sonderlich dadurch beeinträchtigt. Man hat Pius X. ferner auch seine Enzyklika *Pascendi* (8. September 1907) zum Vorwurf gemacht, mit der er sich gegen die Einführung des Modernismus in die kirchlichen Riten wandte, weil er ihn für unvereinbar mit der Integrität des Glaubens ansah. Aber das ist ein Problem, das nur die Katholiken angeht. Da der Verfasser dieses Werkes keinerlei Bindungen gegenüber der Kirche besitzt, also nicht betroffen ist, maßt er sich nicht das Recht an, hierzu Stellung zu nehmen.

Das Ende dieses Pontifikates stand unter dem Zeichen eines anderen, nicht weniger schmerzlichen Ereignisses, das jedoch dieses Mal die ganze Welt betraf: des Ersten Weltkrieges. Hierzu gibt es 240 Zeugnisse von Diplomaten, Prälaten, Professoren und Vertrauten des Papstes, von Gläubigen oder Weltlichen, die in den Akten der *Ordentlichen und apostolischen Prozesse zum Zweck der Selig- und Heiligsprechung Pius' X.* zusammengefaßt und veröffentlicht worden sind, Verfahren, die an den Orten stattfanden, an denen er sein Apostolat als einfacher Priester, als Prälat und dann als Papst ausgeübt hatte, nämlich in Treviso (1923—1926 und 1944—1946), in Mantua (1924—1927 und 1945—1946), in Venedig (1924—1930 und 1944—1946) und in Rom (1923—1931 und 1943—1946). Alle diese Zeugnisse stimmen darin überein, daß Pius X. wegen der Isolierungspolitik Delcassés gegenüber Deutschland, die auf das russisch-französische Bündnis (1894) folgte, von dem Augenblick an, in dem er den Thron Petri bestieg, das Vorgefühl, und von der Balkankrise an die unablässige quälende Vorstellung hatte, daß

dieser Krieg nahe sei. Aus diesen Zeugnissen geht ferner hervor, daß er alles tat, was in seiner Macht stand, um den Krieg zu verhindern, daß er, sobald er von dem Attentat in Sarajewo (am 18. Juni 1914) Kenntnis erhielt, seinen diplomatischen Apparat in Gang setzte und in erhöhtem Maße bei den Staatsoberhäuptern intervenierte, insbesondere beim Kaiser von Österreich, daß er dem letzteren Ende Juli 1914 ein Schreiben sandte, in dem er ihn beschwor, „das Ende seiner Regierungszeit nicht mit Blut zu beflecken“, daß er dem österreichischen Botschafter, der gekommen war, um ihn von dem Ausbruch des Krieges zu unterrichten, und ihn um seinen Segen für die österreichisch-deutschen Armeen bat, entgegnete: „Ich segne den Frieden und nicht den Krieg!“ und ihm, als er darauf drang, zumindest die Person seines Kaisers zu segnen, die schneidende Antwort zuteil werden ließ: „Der Kaiser möge sich glücklich schätzen, noch nicht den Fluch des Heiligen Vaters empfangen zu haben!“, daß seine *Mahnung an die Katholiken der ganzen Welt* vom 2. August 1914 untadelig ist und daß er mit zerissenem Herzen starb, voller Verzweiflung darüber, daß es ihm nicht gelungen war, den Lauf der Ereignisse zu unterbrechen, und dabei unablässig wiederholte: „Oh, dieser Krieg! ... Dieser Krieg — ich fühle es, er wird mein Tod sein.“

Doch er war Papst. Also muß diskutiert werden! Man hat dabei zwei Möglichkeiten: Entweder man läßt dies alles gelten, um sodann zu folgern: „Ja, aber der Grund dafür liegt nicht darin, daß er diesem Krieg feindlich gegenüberstand, sondern in seiner Sympathie für Österreich, dessen Kaiser im Jahre 1903 seine Wahl gefördert hatte, sowie in seiner Befürchtung, Österreich könne ‚zerschlagen‘ aus diesem Krieg hervorgehen¹⁴³.“ Oder man geht vor wie Nobécourt: Man gesteht ein, daß der Papst deutliche Vorahnungen hatte, die er „in erstaunlichen prophetischen Tönen *in seinem engsten Kreise*“¹⁴⁴ äußerte; man hält es für möglich, daß er ein derartiges Schreiben an den Kaiser von Österreich gesandt und den österreichischen Botschafter in dieser Weise empfangen hat.

¹⁴³ Pierre Dominique, *Histoire des Papes*. Quintessenz seiner Ausführungen.

¹⁴⁴ Nobécourt, *Le Vicaire*, S. 120. Von uns kursiv gesetzt.

Allerdings beruft man sich dabei darauf, daß zwar das Schreiben wie auch der Empfang von den kirchlichen Gerichtshöfen, die über die Seligsprechung dieses Papstes entschieden, als beweiskräftig anerkannt wurden, daß jedoch für das Schreiben keinerlei Textbelege, sondern lediglich die Aussagen seines Kaplans, des Abtes Albin de Cigala¹⁴⁵, und seines Staatssekretärs, des Kardinals Merry del Val¹⁴⁶, vorliegen, daß der obenerwähnte Empfang ohne Zeugen stattfand und nur von dem Staatssekretär, dem gegenüber sich Pius X. darüber vertraulich geäußert hatte, bezeugt wurde¹⁴⁶. Sodann zieht man den Schluß, es sei „beim gegenwärtigen Stand der Dinge nicht möglich, sich über die Bedeutung der Interventionen Pius' X. zu äußern¹⁴⁷“. Doch wenn es um die Behauptung eines Kurt Gerstein geht, deren Text man nicht einmal mehr vorzulegen wagt — wenn man es überhaupt jemals konnte! —, sowie um ihre Interpretation durch Leute wie Hochhuth oder Friedländer, dann ergeben sich keine Zweifel mehr, und man hält es auch nicht mehr für nötig, eine Möglichkeit eindeutig als eine solche zu bezeichnen. Denn diese Leute sind Protestanten oder Juden, und man kann mit ihnen schließlich nicht wie mit einem gewöhnlichen Kaplan der katholischen Kirche, einem gewöhnlichen Kardinal oder einem gewöhnlichen Papst umgehen¹⁴⁸!

Beim Tode Pius' X. (20. August 1914) würdigten sämtliche Zeitungen im Lager der Alliierten — einschließlich *L'Humanité*, dem Organ der damaligen sozialistischen Partei Frankreichs — einmütig seine verzweifelten Bemühungen um die Rettung des Friedens. Kardinal Merry del Val berichtet¹⁴⁹: „Ein Diplomat [sein Name wird nicht angegeben] äußerte sich mir gegenüber zu der tragischen Situation des durch den Krieg erschütterten Europas:

*„Die letzte Klarheit“, sagte er zu mir, „und die letzte Aussicht auf Frieden sind mit Pius X. erloschen, und nur noch Finsternis ist um uns herum“*¹⁵⁰.“

¹⁴⁵ Albin de Cigala, *Pie X.*

¹⁴⁶ Merry del Val, *Pie X, souvenirs et impressions*

¹⁴⁷ Nobécourt, *Le Vicaire*, S. 123

¹⁴⁸ In Anhang IV wird ein weiteres Mittel gezeigt, mit dem man über seinen Staatssekretär Merry del Val die Friedenspolitik Pius' X. in Mißkredit zu bringen versuchte.

Der Diplomat irrte sich: Der am 3. September gewählte Benedikt XV. trat mit seiner *Mahnung an die Katholiken der ganzen Welt*¹⁵¹ vom darauffolgenden 8. September sogleich in die Fußstapfen Pius' X.: „Das entsetzliche Schauspiel des Krieges, in dem ein so großer Teil Europas, von Feuer und Schwert verwüstet, von christlichem Blut getränkt ist, hat Uns mit unaussprechlichem Entsetzen und ebensolcher Angst erfüllt ... Wir haben den festen Entschluß gefaßt, nichts außer acht zu lassen, was in Unserer Macht steht, um das Ende eines so großen Unheils herbeizuführen ... Wir bitten und beschwören diejenigen, die die Geschicke der Völker lenken, inständig, zum Heil der menschlichen Gesellschaft ihren Sinn auf die Beilegung ihrer Streitigkeiten zu richten ... Es ist genug der Zerstörungen, es ist genug Blut geflossen!“

Er ließ tatsächlich nichts außer acht: Seine erste *Weihnachtsbotschaft* am 24. Dezember desselben Jahres schlug den Staatsoberhäuptern einen Waffenstillstand während des Weihnachtsfestes vor. Man hörte nicht auf ihn. Dennoch wartete er weiterhin unaufhörlich auf die Gelegenheit, die internationalen Beziehungen wiederherzustellen. Nach dem Tode (21. November 1916) des alten Kaisers Franz Joseph ergab sich diese Gelegenheit am 1. August 1917, nach einer Zeit von acht Monaten also, die er dazu benutzte, die Verbindung zwischen dem neuen Kaiser (dem Neffen des vorhergehenden, er war als Karl IV. König von Ungarn und folgte als Karl I. dem verstorbenen Franz Joseph auf den Thron der Doppelmonarchie) und dessen Schwager, dem Prinzen Sixtus von Parma, der sich auf der Seite der Alliierten befand, herzustellen. Briand und Caillaux sollen sich seinen Bemühungen angeschlossen haben, um eine Unterredung des Prinzen Sixtus von Parma mit der französischen Regierung herbeizuführen. Im März 1917 hatte der neue Kaiser von Österreich ein Friedensangebot gemacht. Benedikt XV. nahm diesen guten Willen zur Kenntnis. Als er außerdem erfuhr, daß der Nuntius in München, Pacelli, der spätere Pius XII., im Juli im Verlauf einer Unterredung mit Wil-

¹⁴⁹ Merry del Val, *Pie X.*, S. 28

¹⁵⁰ Im Text kursiv

¹⁵¹ *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, Bd. V, S. 15—17

helm II. von diesem die Zusicherung erhalten hatte, er sei zu einem Kompromißfrieden bereit, hielt der Papst trotz des Kriegeintritts der Vereinigten Staaten am vorhergegangenen 6. April die Umstände für einen Vermittlungsversuch für günstig. Seine *Mahnung zum Frieden an die Führer der kriegführenden Nationen* vom 1. August 1917 ist in zweifacher Hinsicht verdienstvoll: So wird hier zum ersten Mal in der Geschichte des Papsttums die Aufgabe des Stellvertreters Christi in Kriegszeiten in klaren und bestimmten Worten festgelegt und ferner ein Friedensplan vorgeschlagen, der, von dem Grundsatz des Selbstbestimmungsrechts der Völker abgesehen, nichts anderes ist als das berühmte 14-Punkte-Programm des Präsidenten Wilson.

Im folgenden sehen wir, wie er seine apostolische Mission auffaßte: „Wir haben Uns vor allem drei Aufgaben gestellt: Gegenüber allen Kriegführenden eine vollkommene Unparteilichkeit zu wahren, wie es sich für den gemeinsamen Vater aller Menschen, der alle seine Kinder in gleicher Weise liebt, geziemt; sodann, Uns fortwährend zu bemühen, allen soviel Gutes zu tun wie nur möglich, und zwar ohne Ansehen der Person, der Nationalität oder der Religion, wie es Uns durch das universale Gesetz der Nächstenliebe wie auch durch das Uns von Christus anvertraute höchste geistliche Amt vorgeschrieben ist; und schließlich, wie es Unsere friedentiftende Mission ebenfalls verlangt, nichts zu unterlassen, soweit es in Unserer Macht liegt, was dazu beitragen könnte, das Ende dieses Unheils herbeizuführen, und zwar indem Wir versuchen, die Völker und ihre Führer zu maßvolleren Entschlüssen und zu Friedensberatungen in einer ruhigen Atmosphäre mit dem Ziel eines gerechten und dauerhaften Friedens zu bringen¹⁵².“

Dies ist genau die Haltung, die Pius XII. während des Zweiten Weltkrieges einnahm und die ihm einbrachte, derselben Frevel beschuldigt zu werden: „Ein Papst der Deutschen“, sagte Clemenceau bekanntlich¹⁵³, „schweigsam wie Pius XII.“, überbot ihn Nobécourt¹⁵⁴, und Pierre Dominique fügte hinzu¹⁵⁵: ein Papst, „der

¹⁵² *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, Bd. I, S. 182

¹⁵³ Vgl. oben S. 85

¹⁵⁴ Nobécourt, *Le Vicaire*, S. 126

¹⁵⁵ Dominique, *Le Crapouillot*, S. 62

fürchtete, daß das katholische Österreich-Ungarn vernichtet werden und (auf seinen Trümmern) eine Reihe von Kleinstaaten (entstehen könnte), unter denen Böhmen ein von den Freimaurern beherrschter Staat sein und das katholische Kroatien von den orthodoxen Serben regiert werden würde . . . “, und der von der Vorstellung gepeinigt wurde, „daß die Russen siegen könnten, was einen ungeheuren Prestigegewinn für die Orthodoxie bedeuten würde“, u. a. m. Alles Interpretationen, zu deren Untermauerung man keine anderen Beweise anführen kann als die im eigenen Lager zur Zeit herrschende Stimmung, die Annahme, den Hintergedanken oder die Mutmaßung — Interpretationen, die sämtlich zu beweisen trachten, daß die Stellungnahmen Benedikts XV. nicht aus Liebe zum Frieden erfolgten, sondern aus einer ungewöhnlichen Zuneigung zu dem anderen Lager und aus niederer Berechnung. Wenn man es so nimmt, kann man über jeden beliebigen Menschen jede beliebige Äußerung von sich geben und den edelmütigsten Menschen im schwärzesten Licht darstellen. Man kann dann zum Beispiel behaupten, daß Jacques Nobécourt und Pierre Dominique nur von der Absicht geleitet seien, ganz Europa dem Bolschewismus auszuliefern, und daß ihre Stellungnahmen gegen diese Doktrin lediglich ein leeres Geschwätz seien, mit dem ihr Spiel getarnt werden soll. Und wenn man den progressistischen Charakter — im abwertenden Sinne des Wortes — der gesamten Schriften des ersten oder die Tatsache geltend macht, daß der zweite trotz voller Kenntnis der Auswirkungen des letzten Krieges, deren handgreiflichstes Beispiel darin besteht, daß die Grenze Rußlands bis auf fünfzig Kilometer an Hamburg heranverlagert wurde, die Bemühungen Pius' XII, um eine internationale Konferenz, die den Zweiten Weltkrieg hätte verhindern können, noch mit der Bemerkung kommentiert: „Glücklicherweise nimmt man ihn nicht beim Wort¹⁵⁶“, wäre es wohl nicht schwer, dieser These Glauben zu verschaffen. Kurz, die Argumente der Gegner Pius' X., Benedikts XV. und Pius' XII. sind nichts anderes als auf bloßen Vermutungen beruhende Wertungen und können nur als böswillige Absicht angesehen werden.

¹⁵⁶ Ebd., S. 63

Mit ebenso dürftigen Argumenten wurde auch der Vermittlungsversuch Benedikts XV. vom 1. August 1917 torpediert. Dies hatte zur Folge, daß der Erste Weltkrieg fünfzehn Monate länger dauerte und die Schäden sowie die Anzahl der Kriegsoffer ihre bekannten Ausmaße erreichten, und zwar ohne jeden Gewinn, da der Krieg ohnehin im Versailler Vertrag endete. Was sage ich, ohne Gewinn? Um welchen Preis!

Oh, dieser Versailler Vertrag! Als man erfuhr, daß Benedikt XV. den Bestimmungen dieses Vertrages, die er für ungerecht und voll von Gründen für einen neuen Krieg hielt, nicht zustimmte, fand darin der Feldzug gegen seinen Pazifismus neue Nahrung: Man sah darin eine Bestätigung seiner Freundschaft für Deutschland, das durch den Vertrag zu Boden geworfen, und für Österreich, das durch ihn zerschlagen wurde, und fügte dem noch hinzu, er habe ein Ressentiment gehegt, weil er von der Friedenskonferenz anläßlich der Verhandlungen des Jahres 1915, die über den Kriegseintritt Italiens entschieden, aus Prinzip ferngehalten worden war. Man hütete sich wohl, zu bemerken, daß die Vereinigten Staaten dem Versailler Vertrag aus den gleichen Gründen wie Benedikt XV. ihre Zustimmung versagten.

Pius XI. und Pius XII. machten sich in diesem Punkt die Politik Benedikts XV. zu eigen. Unter den beiden letztgenannten Pontifikaten präzierte und festigte sich die Einstellung des Heiligen Stuhls zugunsten internationaler Verhandlungen noch, sowohl aus einer gewissen Systematik heraus als auch um die Anwendung von Waffengewalt zu vermeiden. Der Friede war seit Pius X. in der Politik des Vatikans ein feststehender Faktor geworden und die Notwendigkeit der Revision des Versailler Vertrages demzufolge eine weitere Konstante. Als erster Politiker ahnte Briand, welcher Prestigezuwachs daraus für die Kirche resultieren und welche Kraft sie dann auf dem Wege zu den Vereinigten Staaten von Europa darstellen würde. Obwohl ursprünglich Urheber des Gesetzes der Trennung von Kirche und Staat, wurde er später gegen Clemenceau zum Verfechter der Wiederaufnahme der diplomatischen Beziehungen mit dem Vatikan¹⁵⁷. Pius XI. fügte der Ursache für diesen Prestigezuwachs noch zwei weitere hinzu: die Missionen für die Verbreitung des Glaubens in den Kolonien und die Normali-

sierung der Beziehungen zwischen der Kirche und den Staaten, bei denen der Grundsatz der Trennung gemäß der Formel des italienischen Garantiesetzes „eine freie Kirche in einem freien Staat“ galt. Diese Normalisierung erfolgte auf dem Wege einer allgemeinen Durchführung der Konkordatspolitik, deren Begründung und rechtliche Formulierung das Verdienst Pius' XII., des damaligen Kardinals Pacelli, war. Die Unterzeichnung des italienischen Konkordats im Jahre 1929, die nach der Wiederaufnahme der diplomatischen Beziehungen mit Frankreich stattfand, erregte weltweites Aufsehen. Man versäumte nicht, darauf hinzuweisen, daß das Papsttum, das sich mit dem aus dem *Risorgimento* hervorgegangenen Regime nicht hatte verständigen können, dies mit dem Mussolinis sehr wohl konnte, da es in ihm nun endlich in Italien eine Regierungsform besaß, die ihm zusagte. Daraus folgerte man, daß das Papsttum faschistisch wäre. Bei dem mit Hitler abgeschlossenen deutschen Konkordat war es noch schlimmer: Da das Papsttum faschistisch war, war es selbstverständlich auch nazistisch. Kein Mensch bemerkte indessen, daß diejenigen, die ihm zum Zeitpunkt der Unterzeichnung des deutschen Konkordats die heftigsten Vorwürfe deswegen machten, gleichzeitig die leidenschaftlichsten Anhänger — um ihnen einmal ein Kompliment zu machen — des Viererpaktes waren, den die demokratischen Regierungen Englands und Frankreichs (im Juni 1933) mit Deutschland, obwohl es nazistisch, und Italien, obwohl es faschistisch war, unterzeichneten.

Als die Gegner der Kirche später angesichts der Enzyklika *Mit brennender Sorge*, die, obwohl im Namen des Glaubens verkündet, eine klare, bestimmte und konzessionslose Verurteilung des Natio-

¹⁵⁷ Gegen Briand führte man Argumente vom gleichen Schlage wie die gegen Pius X., Benedikt XV. und Pius XII. ins Feld: Er träumte nicht deshalb von den Vereinigten Staaten von Europa, weil er eine gerechte und dauerhafte Friedensordnung erstrebte, sondern nur, weil er ein von Ehrgeiz erfüllter Abenteurer war, der für den Fall eines Erfolges nach der Präsidentschaft trachtete. Und als Beweis dafür fügte man hinzu, daß er vom Heiligen Stuhl die Verkündung der unter Pius X. ausgesprochenen, in Anbetracht des Krieges jedoch nicht veröffentlichten Verurteilung der *Action française* erwirken wollte — der *Action française*, die zwar schon im Sterben lag, aber nichtsdestoweniger als die einzige Kraft in der französischen Politik hingestellt wurde, die die Entwicklung auf dieses Ziel hin hindern könnte.

nalsozialismus darstellte, dann doch zugeben mußten, daß sie nicht nazistisch war, war ihre erste Reaktion: Aber warum kündigt der Papst dann nicht das Konkordat auf? Und sie erinnerten sogleich an sämtliche Verbrechen des Nationalsozialismus gegen die Unverletzlichkeit der menschlichen Person, die in ihren Augen eine Kündigung des Konkordats mehr als genug rechtfertigten. Das hieß aber das Wesen der „allumfassenden Vaterschaft“ für die große Menschenfamilie vergessen, die nach der Glaubenslehre die Hauptaufgabe des Stellvertreters Christi darstellt und die nur dem Verhältnis vergleichbar ist, das der Vater in einer leiblichen Familie zu allen seinen Kindern hat. In der leiblichen Familie jedoch schleudert der Vater nicht den Bannfluch gegen Ham und gibt dasjenige seiner Kinder, das vom rechten Weg abkommt, nicht der Ächtung durch seine anderen Kinder preis, ganz gleich, ob dieses Kind zum Verbrecher oder gar zum Mörder wird: Er bleibt der Vater, verurteilt in väterlicher Weise und trachtet das Kind auf den rechten Weg zurückzubringen; wenn ihm das nicht gelingt, betrauert er den Tag, an dem der zum Dieb oder Mörder gewordene Sohn, der aber deswegen trotzdem sein Sohn bleibt, das Gefängnistor durchschreitet oder auf das Schafott steigt. Die Aufgabe des Vaters besteht nicht darin, den Sohn der Rache der Familie oder der gerichtlichen Verfolgung auszusetzen, sondern in jeder Situation ihm zu helfen sich wieder zurechtzufinden. Das gleiche gilt für das Verhältnis des Papstes, des Heiligen *Vaters!*, zu den Völkern, die alle, und zwar mit gleichem Recht, seine Kinder sind. Man sollte froh sein und nicht darüber klagen, daß die Gebote des Glaubens in so hervorragender Weise mit denen der Vernunft übereinstimmen: Das gibt es nicht alle Tage!

Resümierend kann man sagen, daß diese Politik der „allumfassenden Vaterschaft“ für alle Nationen, die man der Initiative Pius' X., Benedikts XV., Pius' XI, und Pius' XII. verdankt, harmonisch diejenige Leos XIII. fortsetzt, die man ebenfalls eine Politik der „allumfassenden Vaterschaft“ nennen könnte, nämlich für die sozialen Klassen, und zwar für alle. Diese beiden einander ergänzenden Arten der Politik führten gemeinsam dazu, daß die Kirche jetzt in der zweiten Hälfte des 20. Jahrhunderts in den Augen der öffentlichen Meinung als der sicherste und mächtigste

Faktor des sozialen wie auch des universalen Friedens erscheint.

Für den universalen Frieden wurde dies sogar von Léon Blum, den man nicht der Willfährigkeit der Kirche gegenüber bezichtigen kann, anerkannt. In seinem in den Jahren 1940/41 im Gefängnis geschriebenen, doch erst 1945 veröffentlichten Buch *A l'Échelle humaine*¹⁵⁸ ging er so weit, zu wünschen, man solle dem Heiligen Stuhl im Gegensatz zu den 1915 für die Friedenskonferenz gefaßten Beschlüssen — Benedikt XV. wurde damals von ihr ausgeschlossen — einen Platz in den internationalen Organisationen einräumen, die mit der Schaffung einer neuen Friedensordnung beauftragt werden würden. Er begründete diesen Standpunkt mit der folgenden Würdigung:

„Diese Rolle würde einer Kirche gewiß willkommen sein, welche von Grund auf friedliebend ist, da sie eine Religion des Friedens verkörpert, und welche es auch sozusagen durch ihre Funktion ist, da ihre Verfassung auf internationalem Boden steht. Der päpstliche Einfluß war immer und ist noch heute im Sinne eines organischen, auf Gerechtigkeit, Gleichberechtigung der Völker und der Menschen, auf Heiligkeit der Verträge beruhenden Friedens wirksam¹⁵⁹.“

Und was den sozialen Frieden angeht, traf das Volk mit gesundem Menschenverstand die Entscheidung zwischen dem Marxismus und der Enzyklika *Rerum novarum*. Gewiß nicht in seinem Vokabular, aber in seinem Handeln, wozu die erstaunlichen Fortschritte der Technik, die den Lebensstandard der Arbeiterschaft seit Beginn des 20. Jahrhunderts so beträchtlich erhöhten, viel beigetragen haben. Dieser Entwicklung war die Enzyklika auf jeden Fall weit- aus besser angepaßt als das *Kommunistische Manifest*, wenn nicht in ihren Prämissen, so doch wenigstens in ihren Schlußfolgerungen. So stellt der Klassenkampf, das Thema des letzteren, verglichen mit der Zusammenarbeit der Klassen, der Schlußfolgerung der ersteren, nur einen Mythos dar, der an Glaubwürdigkeit verliert, während der Gedanke der Zusammenarbeit unablässig an Boden gewinnt.

Zu diesem geistigen Aufstieg der Kirche und dem steten Wach-

¹⁵⁸ Deutsche Fassung: *Blick auf die Menschheit*

¹⁵⁹ *Blick auf die Menschheit*, S. 120

sen ihres Einflusses im sozialen und internationalen Leben seit dem Jahre 1870 haben in erheblichem Maße auch die Argumente beigetragen, die die Rationalisten auf dem eigentlichen Gebiet des Glaubens gegen sie ins Feld führten: Die Päpstin Johanna, die Borgia, Galilei, die Jungfrau von Orléans, die von der Kirche erst verbrannt und dann heiligesprochen wurde, die Albigenser, die Bartholomäusnacht, der Heilige Ignatius von Loyola, Torquemada, Gott und Christus, die niemals existiert haben, der Vatikan, Hauptstadt der systematischen Massenverdummung, Väterchen Combes, Charles Guignebert^{159a} und Prosper Alfarc^{159b}, die Liebschaft des Herrn Pfarrer mit seiner Haushälterin, die Schwarzröcke mit dem Galgenvogelgesicht, dem dicken Bauch und der Mitra des ehrwürdigen Vaters einer anderen Kirche, des verstorbenen kochgeschätzten Bruders F .: M .: Lorulot^{159c}, der Pfarrer von Uruffe^{159d} usw. — alles uralte Kamellen! *Der Stellvertreter*, den man ihnen soeben beigelegt hat, ist von der gleichen Machart und Herkunft. Offenbar ist die Nachricht noch nicht zu den Rationalisten von heute durchgedrungen, daß die Kirche, die sie mit diesen alten Argumenten so schonungslos bekämpfen, seit dem 20. September 1870 tot ist, daß sie nicht mehr die Kirche aus Großvaters Zeiten ist, daß sie mit Urgroßvaters Argumenten nur einen schon seit langem verwesenen Leichnam bekämpfen und daß die wahre Kirche, die von diesen einfältigen Reden gar nicht getroffen wird, sehr lebendig ist und vor ihrer Nase blüht, wächst und gedeiht.

Aus diesem Grunde ist der 20. September 1870 nicht nur eine

^{159a} Charles Guignebert. Geschichtsprofessor an der Sorbonne. Antiklerikal. Hat ein berühmtes Buch geschrieben, um zu beweisen, daß Jesus Christus niemals existiert hat. Dieses Buch wird noch immer von den Rationalisten gegen die Kirche verwendet.

^{159b} Prosper Alfarc. Professor an der theologischen Fakultät der Universität Straßburg. Protestant. Verteidigte die These von Charles Guignebert. Bedeutender Rationalist.

^{159c} F .: M .: (Freimaurer) Lorulot. Antiklerikaler Journalist. Gestorben 1964. Gab in Frankreich zwei antiklerikale Blätter heraus, *La Calotte* und *La Raison*, die den schlimmsten Unsinn über die Pfarrer verbreiteten.

^{159d} *Der Pfarrer von Uruffe*. Uruffe ist ein kleiner Ort in den französischen Vogesen. Im Jahre 1959 brachte der dortige Pfarrer ein junges Mädchen seiner Gemeinde in andere Umstände, tötete es sodann und verging sich in sadistischer Weise an dem Leichnam.

Scheidelinie zwischen zwei Kirchen, sondern natürlich auch eine solche zwischen zwei Epochen: nämlich dem gut zehn Jahrhunderte umfassenden Zeitraum vor diesem Datum, in dem der Glaube unaufhörlich vor der Vernunft auf dem Rückzug war und die weltliche Macht der Kirche allmählich bis zum Nichts reduziert wurde, und dem weniger als ein Jahrhundert umfassenden Zeitraum, in dem der Glaube unaufhörlich gegenüber der durch die Rationalisten lächerlich gemachten Vernunft wieder an Boden gewann und die Kirche in schwerem Kampf einen moralischen Einfluß erlangte, wie sie ihn niemals vorher besessen hatte. Sicherlich wird dieser Einfluß sich, wenn sie diesen Schwung beibehält, eines Tages — vielleicht schon früher, als man denkt — in einer weltlichen Macht ausdrücken, die zwar indirekt, aber weitaus wirksamer und größer sein dürfte als die, die sie einstmals besessen hat.

Wenden wir uns nun der Frage zu, wie wir Pius XII. vor und im Zweiten Weltkrieg den Tatsachen entsprechend einzuordnen haben.

II. DIE BEMÜHUNGEN PIUS' XII. UM EINE VERHINDERUNG DES KRIEGES

Eugenio (Maria Giuseppe Giovanni) Pacelli entstammte einer ebenso guten wie überaus frommen bürgerlichen Familie aus der Toskana. Einer seiner Vorfahren, Advokat an der Rota, gründete 1851 den *Osservatore Romano* und wurde unter Pius IX. Stellvertreter Innenminister des Kirchenstaates. Sein Vater war Terziar des Franziskanerordens und Dekan der päpstlichen Konsistorialadvokaten. Seine Herkunft hatte dem jungen Eugenio Pacelli also bereits alle Voraussetzungen in die Wiege gelegt, daß er sich zu einer geistlichen Laufbahn hingezogen fühlen würde. Seine hervorragende Intelligenz, seine umfassende Bildung, das Milieu seiner Familie sowie auch ein angeborener politischer Instinkt taten das übrige: Im Jahre 1901, unter Leo XIII., tritt er im Alter von 25 Jahren¹⁶⁰ — zwar einfacher Priester, aber Doktor der Theologie,

¹⁶⁰ Er wurde am 2. März 1876 in Rom in der Via di Monte Giordano 34 (heute Via degli Orsini) geboren.

des Zivilrechts, des kanonischen Rechts und des Konkordatsrechts — als Anwärter in die diplomatische Abteilung des Staatssekretariats des Vatikans ein. Im Jahre 1904 wird er Geheimkämmerer Pius' X., 1905 Prälat und Präfekt der Kongregation von Sankt Ivo, sodann Untersekretär der Kongregation für außerordentliche kirchliche Angelegenheiten (1911) und 1914 Sekretär derselben. Am 24. Juni 1914 schließt er das Konkordat zwischen dem Heiligen Stuhl und Serbien ab. Dies ist sein erster Erfolg. Am 20. April 1917 ernennt Benedikt XV. ihn zum Nuntius in München, wo er, nunmehr im Zentrum der Bemühungen um die Wiederherstellung des Friedens, die Anstrengungen des Papstes in geschickter Weise unterstützt. Nach dem Versailler Vertrag ernennt ihn Benedikt XV. zum Nuntius in Berlin (22. Juni 1920). Da er jedoch in München noch durch Angelegenheiten zurückgehalten wird, die seine Anwesenheit erfordern, insbesondere durch die Vorbereitung eines Konkordats mit der neuen bayerischen Regierung, tritt er diesen Posten erst am 1. August 1925 an, nachdem das besagte Konkordat am 24. März 1924 unterzeichnet worden war. In Berlin gilt seine erste Bemühung dem Abschluß eines Konkordats mit Preußen, das am 13. August 1929 zur Unterzeichnung gelangt. Sein Ziel ist es, nach und nach zu einem allgemeinen Konkordat mit dem Nachkriegsdeutschland zu gelangen. Leider ist, als die politische Stimmung für ein solches Vorhaben günstig geworden war, dann Hitler an der Macht und Pacelli auch nicht mehr Nuntius in Berlin, sondern Staatssekretär im Vatikan. Pius XI. hatte ihn dorthin berufen (12. Dezember 1929), weil er seine geistigen Fähigkeiten und Kenntnisse für die Ausarbeitung des italienischen Konkordats (1929) benötigte, und mit Freude die Verdienste Pacellis an dem Abschluß desselben festgestellt. Daraufhin hatte er ihn zunächst zum Kardinal (16. Dezember 1930) und sodann zum Staatssekretär ernannt (7. Februar 1931). Von dieser Stellung aus tat Pacelli noch einen weiteren Schritt in Richtung auf das angestrebte allgemeine deutsche Konkordat, indem er nämlich eines mit Baden zum Abschluß brachte (12. Oktober 1932). Die Ironie des Schicksals wollte es, daß, nachdem seine Bemühungen um dieses allgemeine deutsche Konkordat unter der Weimarer Republik vergeblich gewesen waren, Hitler selbst die Initiative dazu ergriff. Und dies war

der erste Nagel zu seiner Kreuzigung. Der zweite war die Aufrechterhaltung dieses Konkordats: Als es Pius XI. trotz aller Verletzungen durch die Regierung des Dritten Reiches nicht aufgekündigt hatte, legte man dies seinem Staatssekretär zur Last, und das noch um so mehr, als man sah, daß dieser Staatssekretär, nachdem er am 2. März 1939 (an seinem 63. Geburtstag) Papst Pius XII. Geworden war, es ebensowenig kündigte. Da der Leser den Grund bereits kennt¹⁶¹, brauchen wir hierauf nicht noch einmal einzugehen.

Als Staatssekretär von Pius XI. verfolgte Kardinal Pacelli in vollem Einverständnis mit dem Papst die Politik, mit möglichst vielen Staaten diplomatische Beziehungen aufzunehmen, die bestehenden Beziehungen zu festigen, die älteren Konkordate einer Revision zu unterziehen und neue abzuschließen. Als sein Verdienst sei an dieser Stelle noch das österreichische Konkordat (5. Juni 1933) erwähnt, ferner seine Bemühungen bei den baltischen Staaten und sein allerdings vergeblicher Versuch, die 1870 (infolge der Einnahme Roms) abgebrochenen diplomatischen Beziehungen mit Amerika wiederherzustellen.

Es muß bezweifelt werden, daß das Konklave, das ihn auf den Thron Petri erhob, am 2. März 1939 bei der damaligen Lage der Dinge eine bessere Wahl hätte treffen können. Zu seinem geistigen Format und seinem angeborenem Sinn für das Politische kommt noch hinzu, daß er unter vier Päpsten, und zwar ausnahmslos großen Päpsten, in Schlüsselstellungen, in denen er sich unaufhörlich auszeichnete, eine lange Lehre von achtunddreißig Jahren durchlaufen hatte, wodurch er von allen Anwärtern auf den päpstlichen Stuhl höchstwahrscheinlich für dieses Amt am besten vorbereitet war. Und dann nahte mit großen Schritten der Krieg. Kaum gewählt, mußte er sich mit ihm, wie Pius X. und Benedikt XV., unter denen er gedient, die ihn geformt hatten und die daher für ihn beispielgebend sein mußten, auseinandersetzen.

Sicherlich kann ein überzeugter Pazifist die Anschauung Pius' XII. über Krieg und Frieden nicht vorbehaltlos hinnehmen: Er unterschied zwischen einem gerechten und ungerechten Krieg,

¹⁶¹ Vgl. oben S. 109

zwischen einem Angriffs- und einem Verteidigungskrieg und beim Angriffskrieg sogar zwischen einem erlaubten Angriff und einem, dem er zuweilen das Adjektiv „ungerecht“¹⁶² beifügte, was bedeutete, daß es seiner Vorstellung nach auch „gerechte Angriffe“ gab. Er war noch nicht zu jener Auffassung gelangt, daß es weder einen gerechten Angriffs- noch einen gerechten Verteidigungskrieg, ja überhaupt weder einen gerechten noch einen ungerechten Krieg gibt — daß vielmehr alle Kriege ungerecht sind. Aber so anfechtbar seine Anschauung auch sein mag, so hatte sie ihn doch zu der Überzeugung gebracht, daß alle Kriege durch eine Neuordnung der Völkergemeinschaft zu vermeiden sind, zu der man auf dem Wege internationaler Konferenzen sehr leicht gelangen kann, sofern man Sinn für Gerechtigkeit hat. Es ist beachtlich und anerkennenswert, daß ein Papst eine derartige Ansicht vertrat.

Man könnte, glaube ich, über ihn kein besseres Urteil fällen als dieses:

„Noch niemals hat meines Wissens ein Papst mit soviel Entschiedenheit die *Rechtseinheit* der *Völkergemeinschaft*“¹⁶³ und die unumschränkte Geltung des internationalen Rechts bejaht und mit soviel Nachdruck die Auffassung von der absoluten Souveränität des Staates, die diese Einheit zerbreche, verurteilt. Noch niemals hat meines Wissens ein Papst als logische Folge dieser Grundsätze die Schaffung *internationaler Institutionen* gefordert, die über die gerechte Anwendung der *internationalen Abkommen* wachen und zugleich, wenn das Bedürfnis dazu entsteht, ihre *gerechte Revision* ermöglichen sollten. Noch niemals hat ein Papst die *gerechte Verteilung der wirtschaftlichen Reichtümer der Erde* und den *Schutz der kulturellen Rechte der Minderheiten* als wesentliche Aufgaben dieser internationalen Institutionen bezeichnet, noch ein Papst so nachdrücklich und so häufig zu einem wahren Kreuzzug für eine

¹⁶² Insbesondere in seiner Weihnachtsbotschaft 1948, in der man zum Beispiel liest: „Ein Volk, das von einem *ungerechten* Angriff bedroht oder schon dessen Opfer ist, kann, wenn es christlich handeln will, nicht in passiver Gleichgültigkeit verharren . . . “ (Zitiert nach Papst Pius XII., *Vorkämpfer des Friedens*, Berlin 1951, S. 47. — Anm. d. Übers.)

¹⁶³ Im Text kursiv, wie auch alle folgenden in diesem Zitat kursiv gedruckten Stellen.

solche Neuordnung, die Voraussetzung zu einem dauerhaften Frieden, aufgerufen und deswegen an alle Christen und *an alle Menschen guten Willens* überall in der Welt appelliert; vor allem hat meines Wissens noch niemals ein Papst alle diese Erkenntnisse so erschöpfend dargelegt¹⁶⁴.“

Es ist wahr: kein einziger Papst — auch Pius X. und Benedikt XV. nicht. Diese beiden schlugen zwar als erste jenen Weg ein, waren aber nichts anderes als Vorläufer, deren Vorstellungen erst durch ihren Nachfolger endgültig formuliert und präzisiert wurden.

In der internationalen Politik ist auch der Sozialismus nicht weitergegangen, und 1939, in den entscheidenden Stunden, wie auch 1945, als es galt, die sozialistische Theorie in die Praxis umzusetzen, blieb er weit hinter derselben zurück. Ganz anders dagegen Pius XII.

So sagte zum Beispiel am 7. Februar 1932 Msgr. Faulhaber, der Erzbischof von München, in einer Ansprache in der dortigen St. Bonifaz-Kirche folgendes:

„Die Vorbedingungen für einen erlaubten Krieg sind viel seltener als früher gegeben . . .

Man wird den Prediger des Friedens . . . fragen: Was sagst du dazu, daß das Deutsche Reich abgerüstet und wehrlos ist, während die anderen Völker um die Wette rüsten? Antwort: Nach dem Natur- und Völkerrecht haben die Völker gleiches Recht, hat also auch das Deutsche Reich das Recht, gegen einen blutigen Überfall gesichert zu sein. Die Rechtsgleichheit unter den Völkern wird aber nicht dadurch erreicht, daß die deutsche abgerüstete Wehrkraft *aufgerüstet* und in den Wettstreit immer neuer Rüstungen hineingezogen wird, sondern dadurch, daß die aufgerüsteten und übergerüsteten Völker *abgerüstet* werden. Das alte Sprichwort: ‚Wenn du den Frieden willst, rüste den Krieg‘, muß wie ein altes Kriegsboot abgetakelt werden. Die endlosen Rüstungen während des Friedens sind kein Schutz vor dem Krieg, keine Sicherung des Friedens. Das Rüsten um die Wette gibt die ständige Bereitschaft zum Kriege, und

¹⁶⁴ Msgr. Solages, Rektor des *Institut catholique* von Toulouse, *Théologie de la guerre juste*, S. 153 (zitiert nach Duclos, *Le Vatican*, S. 103)

von der Bereitschaft ist der Weg nicht weit zum wirklichen Loschlagen . . . Wenn du den Frieden willst, rüste den *Frieden*¹⁶⁵.“

Diese Gedanken beruhen auf einem der edelsten Grundsätze des praktischen Sozialismus, und man findet sie nahezu Wort für Wort in der Sammlung der Reden Pius' XII. wieder, die er noch als Msgr. Pacelli in der Zeit seiner Nuntiatur in München und Berlin gehalten hat und die durch den deutschen Episkopat im Jahre 1930 herausgegeben wurden.

„Wenn du den Frieden willst, rüste den Frieden“: während des Friedens selbstverständlich, aber auch während des Krieges. Dies war die Richtschnur für das Verhalten Pius' XII. Wenn man jemanden tadeln muß, dann nicht ihn, weil er diesem Prinzip unerschütterlich treu geblieben ist, sondern die Sozialisten, weil sie es vor dem und im Zweiten Weltkrieg aufgegeben haben, obgleich es in den Jahren von 1919 bis 1933 Grundlage ihres außenpolitischen Programms gewesen war. Pius XII. wurde der Jaurès des Zweiten Weltkrieges und während des Krieges zu dem, was die Kienthaler und Zimmerwalder im Ersten Weltkrieg gewesen waren, und zwar wurde er es im Namen der Gebote des Glaubens, während Jaurès, die Kienthaler und die Zimmerwalder nur von denen der Vernunft geleitet waren. Das ist jedoch belanglos, denn er gelangte schließlich zu den gleichen vernunftgemäßen Schlußfolgerungen. Dagegen fällt auf, daß, wenn man diese vernunftgemäßen Schlußfolgerungen bekämpft, man nichts anderes tut, als einem Glauben, der — endlich! — vernünftig zu denken beginnt, eine Vernunft entgegensetzen, die nur noch unvernünftig urteilt. Und das ist zweifellos der Fall bei Hochhuths *Stellvertreter*, Nobécourts *Vicaire et l'Histoire* und Friedländers *Pius XII. und das Dritte Reich*. Im Namen eines anderen Glaubens übrigens, denn die unvernünftig urteilende Vernunft ist nichts anderes als ein weiterer Glaube: der protestantische Glaube beim ersten, der marxistisch-progressistische beim zweiten und der jüdische beim dritten — Glaubensrichtungen, die alle drei täglich mehr und mehr dem Obskurantismus verfallen. Moskau, Tel Aviv und Hochhuth mit seinem *Stellvertreter* liefern hierfür täglich den Beweis — das ist

¹⁶⁵ Zitiert nach *Schönere Zukunft*, Wien, VII. Jg. Nr. 21, vom 21. Februar 1932.

das Schicksal aller vorgefaßten Meinungen. Die Kirche erbrachte dagegen von 1870 an täglich den Beweis dafür, daß sie mehr und mehr ans Licht emportauchte — auf sozialem Gebiet mit Leo XIII., auf dem Gebiet von Krieg und Frieden mit Pius X., Benedikt XV., Pius XI. und Pius XII., in beiden Bereichen sodann mit Johannes XXIII. und heute mit Paul VI. —, wobei sie sich von ihren archaischen Vorurteilen löste, sich hütete, in neue zu verfallen und ihre Stellungnahmen, soweit sie Folgen in der Welt haben könnten, auf Beobachtung und Analyse gründete.

Doch man macht Pius XII. nur sein Verhalten während des Zweiten Weltkrieges zum Vorwurf. Um es richtig zu verstehen, war es notwendig, es mit demjenigen seiner Amtsvorgänger zu vergleichen und seine Persönlichkeit in diesen geschichtlichen Zusammenhang einzuordnen. Da wir nun zu den Ereignissen kommen, muß noch gesagt werden, wie sich Pius XII. in den kritischen Stunden, die über den Krieg entschieden, verhielt.

Da sind zunächst drei Tatsachen, die bereits in den ersten Wochen seines Pontifikats zeigten, wie sehr er sich der Gefahr bewußt war, und die zugleich seine Absichten darlegten:

1. Am Tage seiner Krönung erklärte er in seiner Erwiderung auf die ihm durch den Kardinaldekan Msgr. Pignatelli di Belmonte entbotenen Glückwünsche des Kardinalskollegiums, daß er „das Steuer des Schiffes Petri ergreife, um dieses inmitten so vieler Wogen und Stürme in den Hafen des Friedens zu lenken¹⁶⁶“.

2. Seine erste Homilie, *Quoniam Paschalia* (April 1939), zeigte ihn „mit Besorgnis erfüllt angesichts der Gefahren, denen Europa durch Arbeitslosigkeit, Not und mangelnde Treue gegenüber eingegangenen Verpflichtungen sowie durch die in gewissen Ländern herrschende Mißachtung der unabdingbaren Rechte der Menschenwürde und der Freiheit ausgesetzt ist¹⁶⁷“. Italien war gerade in Albanien eingefallen.

3. Aus einem Schreiben an Msgr. Maglione (20. April 1939) geht hervor, daß er diesen, den er zu seinem Staatssekretär gemacht

¹⁶⁶ *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, XXXI, 1939, S. 127, und *Documentation catholique*, Bd. XI, Col. 419

¹⁶⁷ *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, XXXI, S. 145

hatte (10. März), ersuchte, „in sämtlichen Gemeinden sämtlicher Diözesen während des Monats Mai zu einem Kreuzzug des Gebets aufzurufen, um überall und für alle Menschen Eintracht und Frieden zu erlangen¹⁶⁸“. In der Zwischenzeit nämlich hatte sich zweierlei ereignet: Erstens war das deutsche Protektorat Böhmen und Mähren errichtet worden, das sogleich von den deutschen Truppen besetzt wurde (15. März 1939), und die Slowakei zu einem selbständigen Staat erhoben worden, was gleichbedeutend war mit der Zerschlagung der Tschechoslowakei. Zweitens hatte am 31. desselben Monats England Polen die bedingungslose Garantie seiner territorialen Integrität gemäß den Abmachungen des Versailler Vertrages gegeben. Das zweite Ereignis erschien Pius XII. sogleich als der erste Schritt einer unaufhaltsamen Entwicklung zum Kriege, und er beschloß daher eine diplomatische Offensive, von der an späterer Stelle die Rede sein wird. Die Gebete, zu denen in „sämtlichen Gemeinden sämtlicher Diözesen“ aufgerufen wurde, sollten diese Offensive stützen.

Hinsichtlich des ersten Ereignisses wurde Pius XII. der Vorwurf gemacht, gegen diese, wie man sagt, Verletzung des Münchner Abkommens nicht protestiert zu haben, und man verglich dieses Verhalten mit dem Pius' XI. bei dem Anschluß Österreichs. Pius XI. hatte seinerzeit zwar ebensowenig gegen die Annexion Österreichs durch das Dritte Reich protestiert, aber vom Erzbischof in Wien, Kardinal Innitzer, der anläßlich der Volksabstimmung Bischöfe und Priesterschaft ersucht hatte, für das *Fait accompli* stimmen zu lassen, eine Klarstellung gefordert, die einem Widerruf glich und die im *Osservatore Romano* in der Ausgabe vom 6. April 1938 veröffentlicht wurde.

Zunächst einmal kann man die beiden Ereignisse überhaupt nicht miteinander vergleichen: Der Anschluß Österreichs war lediglich im formellen Recht ein Gewaltstreich. Seit 1919 forderten die Österreicher nahezu einstimmig die Angliederung an das Deutsche Reich (Beschluß der Nationalversammlung vom 4. März 1919 unter dem sozialistischen Kanzler Karl Renner, von der Weimarer Verfassung in Artikel 61 bestätigt, usw.). Der Artikel 88 der Völ-

¹⁶⁸ Ebd., S. 154

kerbundsakte stand jedoch dem Willen der beiden Völker entgegen. Von Salzburg bis Wien wurde Hitler ein triumphaler Einzug bereitet.

Die Zerschlagung der Tschechoslowakei erscheint im Hinblick auf eine Vertragsverletzung, insbesondere die Verletzung des Münchner Abkommens, in einem gänzlich anderen Licht. Das Münchner Abkommen hatte drei Dinge vorgesehen: den Anschluß der Sudeten an das Reich, die Errichtung eines selbständigen Staates Böhmen und Mähren, wobei die Slowakei ebenfalls selbständig werden, die beiden Staaten jedoch unter Beibehaltung des Namens Tschechoslowakei zu einem Bundesstaat vereinigt werden sollten, und schließlich noch die Garantie der territorialen Integrität, die Deutschland diesem Bundesstaat geben würde, „sobald Prag (die Hauptstadt dieses Staates) mit Warschau und Budapest die Frage der polnischen und ungarischen Minderheiten geregelt haben würde¹⁶⁹“.

In dem neuen Bundesstaat stellten sich nun jedoch die Tschechen, die die Mehrheit bildeten, einerseits den Polen und den Ungarn gegenüber taub, andererseits machten sie den Slowaken, die als autonom anzuerkennen sie sich weigerten, das Leben äußerst schwer. Doch es soll lieber André François-Poncet, der nicht der geringsten Sympathie gegenüber dem nazistischen Deutschland geziehen werden kann, überlassen werden darzulegen, wie und durch wen das Münchner Abkommen verletzt wurde: „Innerhalb des tschechoslowakischen Staates hatten die von Msgr. Tiso geführten Slowaken die Autonomie erhalten. Aber die Tschechen weigerten sich, das Land als selbständigen Bundesstaat anzuerkennen. Prag forderte die Absetzung der slowakischen Minister¹⁷⁰ wegen ihrer separatistischen Politik. Hitler ergriff, um seine Absichten zu verwirklichen, für die Slowaken Partei¹⁷¹. Am 13. März 1939 eilte Monsignore Tiso¹⁷² nach Berlin und rief den Schutz¹⁷³ des Führers an¹⁷⁴“.

¹⁶⁹ Georges Bonnet, *Le Quai d'Orsay sous trois Républiques*, S. 259

¹⁷⁰ Also ein Mißbrauch der Amtsgewalt seitens der Tschechen.

¹⁷¹ Das war durchaus normal, denn nach dem Münchner Abkommen waren die Slowaken und nicht die Tschechen im Recht.

¹⁷² Slowakischer Ministerpräsident.

Zunächst haben also die Tschechen das Münchner Abkommen verletzt¹⁷⁵, und Hitler intervenierte lediglich auf Verlangen der Opfer dieser Verletzung. Ganz genauso wie zum Beispiel kürzlich die Belgier und Amerikaner im Kongo intervenierten, um im Auftrag der ohnmächtigen Regierung gegen Rebellen einzuschreiten, die dabei waren, unschuldige Menschen niederzumetzeln. Und ganz genauso wie in zahlreichen gleichgearteten Fällen die Engländer, die Franzosen und die Amerikaner intervenierten, wodurch das Weltgewissen niemals übermäßig beunruhigt wurde, sofern es diese Interventionen nicht sogar billigte.

Von den entrüsteten Beiworten abgesehen, mit denen André François-Poncet seinen Bericht schmückt, haben sich die Dinge wirklich so zugetragen, wie er sagt: Die Tschechoslowakei ging an der Verletzung des Münchner Abkommens durch die Tschechen zugrunde.

Und was konnte Pius XII. schließlich zu den Bedingungen sagen, unter denen dies geschah, da sie ja durch Vereinbarungen zwischen Regierungen festgelegt worden waren, die durch das Münchner Abkommen anerkannt wurden? Einer von ihnen, der tschechischen Regierung, war Gewalt angetan worden, das ist sicher, aber sie nahm ja auch für sich das Recht in Anspruch, einer anderen Regierung Gewalt anzutun. Um sie an weiteren Übergriffen zu hindern, hatte Hitler beschlossen, die Tschechoslowakei zu be-

¹⁷³ Wen sonst konnte er angesichts der geographischen Lage seines Landes um Schutz gegen das erlittene Unrecht bitten?

Die Engländer und Franzosen waren außerstande, dem Münchner Abkommen in diesem Punkte Geltung zu verschaffen, und darüber hinaus auch gar nicht dazu entschlossen, da sie die Partei der Tschechen, also die des Unrechts, ergriffen hatten.

¹⁷⁴ André François-Poncet, *Von Versailles bis Potsdam*, S. 211

¹⁷⁵ Einer derartigen Verletzung gegenüber den Slowaken machten sie sich nicht zum ersten Mal schuldig. Am 30. Mai 1918 hatten die Tschechen und die Slowaken, die im Ersten Weltkrieg die Partei der Alliierten ergriffen hatten, in Pittsburg (USA) durch ihre beiderseitigen Vertreter ein Abkommen getroffen, in dem die Schaffung eines tschechoslowakischen Bundesstaates vorgesehen war, innerhalb dessen jede der beiden ethnischen Gemeinschaften ein selbständiger Staat sein sollte. Tatsächlich hatte Versailles dann aber einen tschechoslowakischen Staat sanktioniert, in dem die Slowaken von den Tschechen unterjocht waren, wie heutzutage die Ostdeutschen, die Ungarn usw. von der Sowjetunion.

setzen. Die einzige Möglichkeit, Hitler an dieser Besetzung zu hindern, bestand in einer allgemeinen Regelung sämtlicher europäischen Streitigkeiten durch eine internationale Konferenz, die sich dieses Ziel gesetzt hätte (Revision des Versailler Vertrages, vorgesehen durch Artikel 19 der Völkerbundsakte). Aber, nachdem man eine derartige Konferenz der Weimarer Republik verweigert hatte, verwehrte man sie nun auch Hitler, der auf den Vorschlag Roosevelts vom 16. Mai 1933 hin bereits am nächsten Tag, dem 17. Mai, in einer Rede vor dem Reichstag eine solche Konferenz im Prinzip begeistert akzeptierte. Auf eine Konferenz dieser Art konzentrierte daher Pius XII. seine Bemühungen, und im darauffolgenden Mai machte er einen entsprechenden Vorschlag.

Diese Konferenz hätte im übrigen nicht nur die Aufgabe gehabt, sich erneut mit dem tschechoslowakischen Problem zu befassen, denn zur gleichen Zeit, als Hitler im Einverständnis mit den Slowaken die bekannte Lösung hierfür lieferte, war schon ein weiteres Problem durch eine andere Provokation entstanden, nämlich das polnische.

Bis dahin standen die Deutschen und die Polen in sehr gutem Einvernehmen. Es bestand ein Bündnisvertrag vom 26. Januar 1934 zwischen ihnen, der vortrefflich funktionierte, und ihre Beziehungen waren äußerst herzlich. Abermals berichtet uns François-Poncet darüber:

„Oberst Beck stand mit Göring auf vertrautem Fuße, und dieser folgte jedes Jahr einer Einladung zur Jagd in den polnischen Wäldern. Bei diesen freundschaftlichen Zusammenkünften sprach man natürlich auch über die Danziger Frage und den polnischen Korridor, also über Probleme, die eines Tages im Interesse der guten Beziehungen der beiden Länder gelöst werden mußten. Oberst Beck gab zu verstehen, Polen werde sich nicht weigern, Danzig an das Reich zurückzugeben, wenn es dort wirtschaftliche Vorrechte beibehielte. Auch würde sich Polen mit einer exterritorialen Autobahn und Eisenbahnlinie, also einer direkten Verbindung zwischen West- und Ostpreußen, einverstanden erklären¹⁷⁶.“

¹⁷⁶ François-Poncet, *Von Versailles bis Potsdam*, S. 213

Die beiden Parteien waren sich also einig.

Als Ribbentrop jedoch am 21. März dem polnischen Botschafter in Berlin, Lipski, vorschlug, diplomatische Gespräche aufzunehmen, um dieser Übereinstimmung eine offizielle Form zu geben, reiste dieser nach Warschau und kehrte am 26. mit einer negativen Antwort von dort zurück. Und wie um diesem negativen Bescheid sein volles Gewicht zu verleihen, unterrichtete außerdem der deutsche Botschafter in Polen, von Moltke, am 24. März, dem Tag nach seiner Ankunft in Warschau, Berlin darüber, daß alarmierende Gerüchte über die Absichten Deutschlands gegenüber Polen in Umlauf seien. Am Tag darauf, dem 25. März, meldete der Chef der Abwehr, Canaris, die Mobilmachung von drei Reservistenjahrgängen sowie polnische Truppenkonzentrationen um Danzig herum.

Was war geschehen?

Am 18. März „hatte Litwinow ... eine europäische Konferenz zu dem Zweck, Hitler Einhalt zu gebieten, vorgeschlagen, diesmal unter Teilnahme Frankreichs, Englands, Polens, Rußlands, Rumäniens und der Türkei¹⁷⁷“. Am gleichen Tage „gaben mehrere Agenturen bekannt, daß Deutschland Rumänien soeben ein Ultimatum gestellt habe und daß die rumänische Regierung, von Furcht ergriffen, Hitler die Bodenschätze ihres Landes überlassen habe¹⁷⁸“.

Dies war eine Falschmeldung. Bonnet, der erklärt, er habe erst 1944 durch die Worte des rumänischen Außenministers Grigore Gafencu: „1939 hat es in Bukarest niemals auch nur irgendein deutsches Ultimatum gegeben“ Gewißheit darüber erlangt, stellt dieses Manöver als eine Provokation hin. Als die Verantwortlichen dafür sieht er die englischen Kriegstreiber an, an deren Spitze sich soeben Lord Halifax gesetzt hatte¹⁷⁹. Als jedoch das Foreign Office am 18. März 1939 an den rumänischen Geschäftsträger in London, Tilea, eine diesbezügliche Anfrage richtete, bestätigte dieser das Ultimatum. Chamberlain berief daraufhin sogleich sein Kabinett ein. Es wurde der Beschluß gefaßt, daß Großbritannien die terri-

¹⁷⁷ William L. Shirer, *Aufstieg und Fall des Dritten Reiches*, S. 428

¹⁷⁸ Bonnet, *Le Quai d'Orsay*, S. 261

¹⁷⁹ Ebd., S. 262

toriale Integrität Rumäniens garantieren sollte. Gleichzeitig sollte Polen, dessen Mitwirkung strategisch notwendig war, ersucht werden, das gleiche zu tun. Oberst Beck erklärte sich einverstanden unter der Bedingung, daß Großbritannien auch die territoriale Integrität Polens garantiere. Auf dieser Ebene wurde am 21. März verhandelt und am 31. März eine definitive Vereinbarung getroffen. Dies war der Grund für das Umschwenken Polens: Denn auf Grund der sich anbahnenden Beziehungen zwischen England und Rußland war Polen durch die britische Garantie gegen die Unternehmungen Rußlands weitaus mehr geschützt als durch den deutsch-polnischen Vertrag. Nur wußte Oberst Beck nicht, daß sich zur gleichen Zeit gleichartige Beziehungen auch zwischen dem Dritten Reich und Rußland anbahnten.

Im Vertrauen auf diese Garantie sollte Oberst Beck von nun an alles für erlaubt halten. Als erster erkannte Pius XII., was sich daraus ergeben könnte. Als Hitler, der die Überzeugung gewonnen hatte, daß das Umschwenken Polens unwiderruflich sei, am 26. April gleichzeitig den deutsch-polnischen Vertrag vom 26. Januar 1934 und das britisch-deutsche Flottenabkommen vom 18. Juni 1935 aufkündigte, gab es für Pius XII. an der Notwendigkeit eines Vermittlungsversuches keinen Zweifel mehr.

Doch Präsident Roosevelt war ihm zuvorgekommen: Am 14. April hatte er persönlich an Hitler und Mussolini ein Schreiben gerichtet, und zwar ausschließlich an sie. Er stellte ihnen darin geradeheraus die Frage: „Sind Sie bereit zu versichern, daß Ihre Streitkräfte das Territorium keines der nachstehend aufgezählten Staaten angreifen oder besetzen werden?“ Es folgte eine Liste von 31 Ländern. Sodann wurde der Hoffnung Ausdruck gegeben, daß eine solche Garantie „sechs Jahre und vielleicht sogar ein Vierteljahrhundert“ Frieden bedeuten könnte. Schließlich versprach er für den Fall einer positiven Antwort die Teilnahme der Vereinigten Staaten „an weltweiten Gesprächen mit dem Ziel, die Welt von der erdrückenden Last des Rüstens zu befreien“.

Das hieß Hitler und Mussolini allein als die Kriegstreiber hinstellen. Und das war im Hinblick auf die diplomatischen Gepflogenheiten eine grobe Unhöflichkeit, wenn nicht eine Provokation. „Eine Folge der fortschreitenden Lähmung“, sagte Mussolini beim

Empfang dieses Schreibens. Und Göring kommentierte: „Beginnende Geisteskrankheit.“ Und, meiner Treu . . . !

Hitler ließ ankündigen, er werde am 28. April in einer Rede vor dem Reichstag antworten, wie er es schon einmal auf einen höflicheren, inhaltsschwereren und vernünftigeren Vorschlag desselben Präsidenten Roosevelt am 17. Mai 1933 getan hatte.

Um einerseits einleuchtend darzulegen, inwieweit es möglich war, den Zweiten Weltkrieg zu vermeiden, und welche Haltung Hitler gegenüber Krieg und Frieden einnahm, und andererseits den Unterschied zwischen jenem früheren Vorschlag und demjenigen vom 14. April zu verdeutlichen, ist es notwendig, auf die Vorgänge des 16. und 17. Mai 1933 zurückzugehen.

Am 16. Mai 1933 hatte Präsident Roosevelt an die Staatsoberhäupter von 44 Nationen eine Botschaft gerichtet, in der er die Hoffnungen und Pläne der Vereinigten Staaten zum Thema Frieden durch Abrüstung darlegte, nämlich Abschaffung aller Angriffswaffen, und zwar zunächst der Bomber, Panzer und schweren Artillerie, Beschränkung der gesamten Rüstung, Truppenstärke usw. auf den Stand Deutschlands.

Die Antwort Hitlers erfolgte prompt und ohne Umschweife schon am nächsten Tag, dem 17. Mai, in einer Rede vor dem Reichstag. Sie war ein mitreißendes Glaubensbekenntnis für den Frieden, eine Kriegserklärung an den Krieg und verhieß ein vollkommenes Einvernehmen unter den Staaten Europas, sofern der Vorschlag Präsident Roosevelts bei den anderen Nationen die gleiche Aufnahme finden würde wie bei Deutschland. In der Rede hieß es:

„Der Vorschlag des amerikanischen Präsidenten Roosevelt, von dem ich heute nacht Kenntnis erhielt, verpflichtet die deutsche Regierung zu warmem Dank. Sie ist bereit, dieser Methode zur Behebung der internationalen Krise zuzustimmen . . . Dieser Vorschlag bedeutet eine große Beruhigung für alle, die an der aufrichtigen Erhaltung des Friedens mitarbeiten wollen . . . Deutschland ist ferner ohne weiteres bereit, auf Angriffswaffen überhaupt Verzicht zu leisten, wenn . . . die gerüsteten Nationen ihrerseits diese Angriffswaffen vernichten . . . Deutschland wäre auch ohne weiteres bereit, seine gesamte militärische Einrichtung überhaupt

aufzulösen und den kleinen Rest der ihm verbliebenen Waffen zu zerstören, wenn die anliegenden Nationen ebenso restlos das gleiche tun würden . . . Deutschland ist bereit, jedem feierlichen Nichtangriffspakt beizutreten, denn Deutschland denkt nicht an einen Angriff, sondern an seine Sicherheit¹⁸⁰.“

Die ganze Welt atmete auf. Selbst die Sozialdemokraten im Reichstag spendeten dieser Rede Beifall. Man konnte zugegebenermaßen keine besseren Worte finden.

Dennoch blieb die Rede ohne praktische Folgen. Als der Vorschlag Roosevelts am darauffolgenden 14. Oktober vor dem Völkerbund zur Debatte gestellt wurde, verlangten die später im Krieg gegen Deutschland verbündeten Mächte acht (!) Jahre, um ihre Rüstung auf den Stand Deutschlands zu reduzieren. Dies bedeutete, daß sie acht Jahre lang Deutschland auf dem Rüstungssektor keinerlei Gleichberechtigung mit den anderen Nationen zugestehen würden. Und 15 Jahre lang schon hatte man auf derartige Vorschläge, denen Deutschland positiv gegenübergestanden war, ähnlich hinhaltende Antworten gegeben.

Das hieß die Welt zum besten haben. Doch dieses Mal verließ Deutschland den Völkerbund und schlug damit die Türen hinter sich zu. Die Entscheidung wurde in einer Volksabstimmung am darauffolgenden 12. November von 96 % der deutschen Wählerschaft gebilligt.

Nach all dem noch zu behaupten, es habe keinerlei Verhandlungsmöglichkeiten mit Hitler gegeben, ist eine Entstellung der Tatsachen. Am 14. Oktober 1933 haben die Alliierten selbst den Beweis erbracht, daß der Mangel an Verhandlungsbereitschaft eindeutig auf ihrer Seite lag, genauso wie seinerzeit gegenüber der Weimarer Republik. Sechs Jahre später lieferte das Schreiben Roosevelts vom 14. April 1939 an Hitler und Mussolini allein schon durch seine Formulierung dafür einen erneuten Beweis. Hitler reagierte sehr scharf.

Am 17. April ließ er durch Ribbentrop sämtlichen von Roosevelt aufgeführten Staaten (selbstverständlich mit Ausnahme von Polen, Rußland, Großbritannien und Frankreich, deren so und so

¹⁸⁰ Shirer, *Aufstieg*, S. 206 f.

oft öffentlich wiederholte Absichten er kannte) zwei Fragen vorlegen. Erstens: Hatten sie den Eindruck, von Deutschland bedroht zu sein? Und zweitens: Hatten sie Roosevelt beauftragt, jenen Vorschlag in jener Form zu unterbreiten? Die 27 Staaten, an die die Anfrage erging, antworteten einstimmig mit einem zweifachen Nein. Das war für ihn ein beispielloser diplomatischer Erfolg. Er wurde am nachfolgenden 28. April in einer Rede herausgestellt, in der Hitler die 27 Antworten verlas und seine Vorschläge für eine internationale Konferenz, auf der die Überreste des Versailler Vertrages einer Revision unterzogen werden sollten, wiederholte. Damit wurde Roosevelt öffentlich der Lächerlichkeit preisgegeben. Die Folgerung Friedländers hierzu — vergessen wir nicht, daß er Professor für Zeitgeschichte am *Institut universitaire des Hautes Études internationales* in Genf ist, denn es beweist, daß die Kühe in der Schweiz genauso gut gehütet werden wie auch anderswo! — lautet: „Die Botschaft Roosevelts findet außer in Deutschland, Italien und anscheinend [sic] beim Vatikan in der ganzen Welt eine günstige Aufnahme¹⁸¹“. In Wirklichkeit sah es anders aus: Die Russen nahmen überhaupt nicht Stellung, sie standen nämlich mit Deutschland bereits in Unterhandlungen wegen eines Nichtangriffspaktes, der am 23. August des gleichen Jahres paraphiert wurde und die Teilung Polens vorsah¹⁸². Die gesamte übrige Welt aber mit Ausnahme der polnischen, englischen und französischen Kriegstreiber

¹⁸¹ Friedländer, *Pius XII.*, S. 26

¹⁸² Am 3. Oktober 1938, wenige Tage nach der Münchner Konferenz, hatten die Russen aus Verärgerung darüber, daß sie von den Westmächten nicht zugezogen worden waren, über ihre Handelsmission in Deutschland Wirtschaftsbeziehungen zu Berlin aufgenommen. Die Unterhandlungen schleppten sich hin. Doch vom 31. März, von dem Augenblick an, als die Russen die Überzeugung gewonnen hatten, daß der Parteiwechsel der Polen unwiderruflich war, erkannten sie plötzlich, wie vorteilhaft diese Beziehungen für sie sein konnten. Noch klarer wurde ihnen das durch die Rede Hitlers vom 28. April, in der er die Russen entgegen seiner Gewohnheit nicht angriff. Am 20. März 1939 hatte Stalin — während Chamberlain den Presseagenturen Glauben schenkte, die die Meldung von einem deutschen Ultimatum an Rumänien verbreiteten, und Rumänien und danach auch Polen die englische Garantiezusicherung gab — ein offizielles Kommuniqué veröffentlicht in dem er aufgefordert in Abrede stellte, daß „Moskau Rumänien und Polen für den Fall, daß Druck auf sie ausgeübt würde, eine Garantiezusage gegeben habe“. Am Tage nach Hitlers Rede vor dem Reichstag unternahmen die Russen

und Saul Friedländers sah in der in dieser Form unternommenen Intervention Roosevelts einen unbeschreiblichen diplomatischen Schnitzer. Es ist daher verständlich, daß Pius XII., der ein Gefühl für das Lächerliche besaß, sich diesem Schritt nicht anschloß. Im übrigen hatte Roosevelt völlig auf eigene Faust gehandelt und Pius XII. ebensowenig um seine Unterstützung gebeten¹⁸³ wie die 31 Länder, die er in seinem Schreiben anführte und von denen sich kein einziges, selbst Polen, Frankreich und England nicht, die sein Vorgehen billigten, in dieser Angelegenheit noch weiter offiziell zu ihm bekannte. Warum macht man also Pius XII. einen Vorwurf, wenn man den anderen keinen macht?

Das Vermittlungsprojekt Pius' XII. entsprach weit mehr der Tonart und den Gepflogenheiten der Diplomatie. Es beruhte auf weit vernünftigeren Vorstellungen, war besser der Situation angepaßt und wesentlich substantieller, daher auch weit erfolgversprechender, wenn man danach gehandelt hätte.

Der Plan sah in seinem Kern die Regelung sämtlicher zwischen den Staaten Europas bestehenden Streitigkeiten vor und betraf folgende fünf Länder: England, Frankreich, Italien, Deutschland und Polen. Streitgegenstände bildeten zwischen England und Deutschland die Kündigung des deutsch-englischen Flottenabkommens sowie die englische Garantie für Polen, zwischen England

einen zweiten Schritt in Richtung auf ein Wirtschaftsabkommen mit Deutschland. Man zeigte bei den über die russische Handelsmission geführten Verhandlungen von beiden Seiten mehr Einsicht, und schließlich, ein Wort ergab das andere . . .

¹⁸³ Obgleich keines der bisher veröffentlichten Dokumente eine Bestätigung dieser Information bietet, behauptet Msgr. Giovannetti demgegenüber (*Der Vatikan und der Krieg*, S. 49), Präsident Roosevelt habe Unterstaatssekretär Sumner Welles beauftragt, den Papst zu unterrichten. Dieser habe jedoch den Vorschlag, seinerseits bei Hitler zu intervenieren, als nicht opportun abgelehnt. Giovannetti steht mit dieser Behauptung allein da. Selbst Friedländer wagt nicht, sie zu übernehmen. Das ist im übrigen auch ohne Bedeutung. Sollten sich die Dinge wirklich so abgespielt haben, so müßte man Pius XII. zur Zurückweisung dieses Vorschlages beglückwünschen. Denn — wie Giovannetti zugibt, Friedländer aber wohlweislich nicht anführt — „der Umstand, daß Roosevelt sich nur an zwei der in Frage kommenden Parteien gewandt hatte“, hat ganz den Anschein, „als ob man sie [Hitler und Mussolini] a priori auf die Anklagebank habe setzen wollen“ (*Der Vatikan und der Krieg*, S. 48)

und Italien die Suezfrage, zwischen Frankreich und Italien die italienischen Forderungen in Nordafrika und zwischen Frankreich und Deutschland dessen Politik in Europa. Schließlich bestand noch der Gegensatz zwischen Deutschland und Polen. Das Projekt sollte in folgender Weise durchgeführt werden: Zwei dieser fünf Staaten gehörten nicht mehr dem Völkerbund an. Eine Beilegung der Streitigkeiten im Rahmen dieser Organisation, das heißt eine Regelung ohne Mitwirkung der Beteiligten, war daher ausgeschlossen. Als Lösungsweg verblieb also nur eine Regelung durch Kontakte unter den fünf Staaten. Hier erhebt Friedländer die Frage, warum nicht auch Rußland zu dieser Regelung hinzugezogen werden sollte, und versucht dem Leser einzureden, der Grund hierfür sei Pius' XII. „persönliche Abneigung gegen den Kommunismus . . . , die auf seine ‚Kontakte‘ mit den . . . Sowjets (in Bayern) im Jahre 1919 zurückgeht¹⁸⁴“. In Wirklichkeit ist die Antwort sehr viel einfacher: Weil Rußland nämlich von keinem der bewußten Streitfälle betroffen war. Aus dem gleichen Grunde hatte man Rußland schon von der Münchner Konferenz ferngehalten. Daß Pius XII. dem Kommunismus feindlich gegenüberstand, steht außer Zweifel. Die Enzyklika *Divini Redemptoris* Pius' XI., in der er seine Grundsätze niedergelegt hatte, bringt das deutlich zum Ausdruck. Doch die Behauptung, er hätte Rußland auch dann nicht in sein Projekt mit einbezogen, wenn es in die europäischen Streitfragen verwickelt gewesen wäre, ist eine völlig unbegründete Hypothese. Aus dem gleichen Grunde wie Rußland waren auch die Vereinigten Staaten nicht berücksichtigt.

Um ganz sicherzugehen, daß er niemanden vor den Kopf stoßen würde, ließ Pius XII., bevor er seinen Plan den Beteiligten unterbreitete, durch seine diplomatischen Dienste entsprechend sondieren. Im folgenden sei nun dargelegt, wie die Ereignisse sich abspielten:

1. Am 1. Mai empfing Mussolini den Jesuitenpater Tacchi Venturi, der ein persönlicher Freund von ihm war und ihn im Namen des Papstes um seine Meinung fragte. Der Duce erbat sich einen Tag Bedenkzeit. Am 2. Mai, wie versprochen, beantwortete er die

¹⁸⁴ Friedländer, *Pius XII.*, S. 28

an ihn gerichtete Frage durch eine rückhaltlose Billigung. Als der Abgesandte des Papstes ihn daraufhin fragte, wie Hitler seiner Meinung nach reagieren werde, erwiderte er, „er neige zu der Ansicht, daß er ... [den Vorschlag] nicht ablehnen werde“. Er fügte lediglich als guten Rat hinzu, „daß es bei der Konferenzeinladung ratsam sei, ... klar den Zweck zu nennen, nämlich in friedlicher Weise jene Fragen zu regeln, welche die fünf Mächte entzweit hielten, und auch jene, die sonst noch damit verbunden seien¹⁸⁵“.

2. Mit dieser Wegzehrung versehen, unterbreitete Staatssekretär Msgr. Maglione am folgenden Tag, dem 3. Mai, den Nuntien in Berlin, Paris, Warschau und London den Vorschlag des Papstes. Am 5. Mai wurde Msgr. Orsenigo in Begleitung Ribbentrops von Hitler in Berchtesgaden empfangen. Aus dem Bericht über diese Unterredung, den er am Tag darauf an das Staatssekretariat richtete¹⁸⁶, sowie aus dem deutschen Memorandum darüber¹⁸⁷ geht hervor, daß Hitler „nicht an eine Kriegsgefahr glaube, da die gespannte Stimmung mehr auf Hetze als auf Tatsachen zurückzuführen sei“ und daß er vor der Erteilung seiner endgültigen Antwort „sich zuerst mit Mussolini in Verbindung setzen müsse, denn er wolle nichts ohne diesen unternehmen ... Für alle Zukunft würden er und der Duce zusammengehen.“

Für einen, der die Antwort des Duce kannte, war das ermutigend¹⁸⁸.

3. Der Pariser Nuntius, Msgr. Valerio Valeri, wurde am 6. Mai von Außenminister Georges Bonnet empfangen. Dieser sagte ihm zunächst, daß er, bevor er ihm eine endgültige Antwort geben

¹⁸⁵ Giovannetti, *Der Vatikan*, S. 53

¹⁸⁶ Ebd., S. 55 ff.

¹⁸⁷ Die Aufzeichnung wurde von einem gewissen Hewel gemacht und trägt das Datum vom 10. Mai 1939. Zitiert bei Friedländer, *Pius XII.*, S. 27 f., nach *Akten zur deutschen auswärtigen Politik D VI* S. 353 f.

¹⁸⁸ Über die Antwort Hitlers sind die Ansichten geteilt. François Charles-Roux sagt, „eine beruhigendere Antwort war nicht denkbar“, bezeichnet sie jedoch als ein „Meisterwerk der Verstellung“ (*Huit ans au Vatican*, S. 318). Im *Journal du Comte Ciano*, Neufchatel, findet man unter dem Datum vom 8. Mai einen Bericht über die Zusammenkunft, die er am 6. und 7. Mai mit Ribbentrop in Rom hatte und bei der das Projekt des Papstes zur Sprache kam. In dem Bericht heißt es: „Der Führer hält den Gedanken einer Kon-

könne, sich mit dem Herrn Ministerpräsidenten sowie mit Herrn Alexis Léger, dem Generalsekretär des Außenministeriums, besprechen müsse. Kurz nach diesem Bescheid rief er ihn jedoch an und bat ihn noch am gleichen Abend erneut zu sich. Er erklärte ihm, daß die französische Regierung den Schritt nicht als opportun erachte, ersuchte ihn jedoch, „den Kardinalstaatssekretär zu bitten, die Botschaft [einstweilen] nicht abzuschicken¹⁸⁹“.

Die Ansicht Msgr. Valerio Valeris über den von ihm unternommenen Schritt ist in seinem Schreiben an das Staatssekretariat vom 12. Mai niedergelegt. Der Vermittlungsversuch des Papstes war zu diesem Zeitpunkt bereits gescheitert:

„Alles in allem ist klar, daß die sogenannten demokratischen Staaten augenblicklich keine Fühlungnahme wünschen. Sie wollen vielmehr die der Ausdehnungslust der totalitären Staaten gezogene Schranke befestigen und verbreitern. Sie [die Demokratien] sind übrigens davon überzeugt, daß sich binnen weniger Monate die Waage der Macht völlig auf ihre Seite neigen wird. Das wurde mir von Herrn Bonnet gesagt und ... von Herrn Bullitt, dem Botschafter der Vereinigten Staaten, wiederholt. Dieser verheimlichte mir nicht seine Befriedigung darüber, daß der Schritt des Heiligen Stuhles keine Folgen haben werde. Auch seine Meinung nach sei es tatsächlich alles in allem gesehen erforderlich, daß die totalitären Staaten mit dem Rücken an die Wand gestellt würden; nur dann und nachdem sie die Garantien gegeben hätten, auf die Herr Roosevelt in seiner Botschaft anspielte¹⁹⁰ ... , könne man mit der Diskussion beginnen¹⁹¹.“

ferenz für nicht annehmbar ... [er] schlägt vor, dem Vatikan mitzuteilen, daß man dem Papst für seinen Vorschlag dankbar sei, es jedoch nicht für möglich halte, ihm zuzustimmen ... “ (Siehe auch *Les Archives secrètes du Comte Ciano 1936–1942*, Paris 1948, S. 282.) Am besten hält man sich also an die offiziellen Dokumente der beiden Parteien, die in diesem Falle übereinstimmen: Am 6. Mai stimmte Mussolini dem Vorschlag des Papstes im Prinzip zu. Hitler, der keinen Einwand dagegen erhob, sagte, daß er vor Erteilung einer offiziellen Antwort zuerst Mussolini konsultieren müsse.

¹⁸⁹ Nach dem Bericht Msgr. Valerio Valeris, zitiert von Msgr. Giovannetti, und auch nach Msgr. Giovannetti selbst (Giovannetti, *Der Vatikan*, S. 60 f.)

¹⁹⁰ Vgl. oben S. 124, Roosevelts Botschaft und ihre Folgen.

¹⁹¹ Das Schreiben ist zitiert bei Giovannetti, *Der Vatikan*, S. 61 f.

Am 7. Mai hatte ihm Alexis Léger seine Ablehnung des Gedankens einer Konferenz in nahezu gleichen Worten ausgedrückt.

4. Der Nuntius in London, Msgr. Godfrey, wurde am 5. Mai von Lord Halifax empfangen, der ihm den Standpunkt der britischen Regierung darlegte: „Seine Heiligkeit mögen Deren gute Dienste getrennt Deutschland und Polen, Frankreich und Italien anbieten¹⁹².“

Auch hier also eine Ablehnung des Vermittlungsangebotes.

5. Die Antworten aus Paris und London, die dem Heiligen Stuhl am 7. Mai vorlagen, zerstörten sämtliche Hoffnungen, die die Antworten aus Italien und Deutschland in den Vorstellungen des Staatssekretärs und des Papstes hatten aufkeimen lassen. Am 8. Mai traf die Antwort Polens ein. Sie war offensichtlich den Stellungen Frankreichs und Englands angeglichen. Der offizielle und endgültige Bescheid der Achsenmächte erfolgte gemeinsam. Er traf als letzter ein, und zwar am 9. Mai. In voller Kenntnis der negativen Antworten Frankreichs, Englands und Polens wurde darin geltend gemacht, „wegen der inzwischen eingetretenen Besserung der internationalen Lage halte man den Schritt [einer Fünf-Mächte-Konferenz] für verfrüht und für augenblicklich nicht notwendig; auch wolle man die hohe Autorität des Papstes nicht exponieren¹⁹³.“

Angesichts des *Fait accompli* konnten Hitler und Mussolini sich auch gar nicht anders äußern.

Friedländer konnte die chronologische Entwicklung des Vermittlungsversuches Pius' XII. bis hin zum Scheitern desselben nicht unbekannt sein, und sei es auch nur durch das von ihm so häufig zitierte Buch Giovannettis. Aber er sagt keinen Ton darüber! Sollte das geschehen sein, um die Verantwortlichen an diesem Scheitern, die von dieser Chronologie so erbarmungslos aufgezeigt werden, nicht kenntlich zu machen?

Der Text der Botschaft, die Pius XII. jedem der fünf Staatsechefs als Einladung zu einer gemeinsamen Konferenz zu übermitteln gedachte, ist meines Wissens nicht offiziell bekannt gemacht wor-

¹⁹² Bericht Msgr. Godfreys, zitiert bei Giovannetti, *Der Vatikan*, S. 64

¹⁹³ Zitiert bei Giovannetti, *Der Vatikan*, S. 59

den. Man erfuhr den Inhalt zunächst lediglich durch Indiskretionen der diplomatischen Presse, womit die Londoner *News Chronicle* in ihrer Ausgabe vom 9. Mai begann. Ihre Meldung wurde in den folgenden Tagen von der Pariser Presse aufgegriffen. Weiteren Aufschluß über den Inhalt der Botschaft gab die Ansprache des Papstes an das Kardinalskollegium am 2. Juni¹⁹⁴, die einen öffentlichen Aufruf zum Frieden auf dem Wege internationaler Gespräche darstellte. Man erfuhr den Inhalt ferner durch den herzlichen Beifall, mit dem die Presse der gesamten Welt, namentlich die der neutralen Länder, diese Ansprache vom 2. Juni aufnahm.

Von da an verliefen die Friedensbemühungen Pius' XII. so wie es Lord Halifax anlässlich der Ablehnung der Fünf-Mächte-Konferenz als wünschenswert erachtet hatte: zugunsten der Wiederherstellung normaler Beziehungen zwischen Polen und Deutschland einerseits und Frankreich und Italien andererseits.

Doch damit hatte er ebensowenig Erfolg.

Von diesen Bemühungen Pius' XII. erwähnt Friedländer lediglich diejenigen hinsichtlich Deutschlands und Polens. Sie waren vor allem durch die Ratschläge zur Mäßigung und Vorsicht gekennzeichnet, die der Papst durch seinen Nuntius in Warschau, Msgr. Cortesi, der polnischen Regierung mehrfach aussprechen ließ. Am 30. und 31. August ging er sogar so weit, Konzessionen zu empfehlen: die Rückkehr Danzigs zum Reich, die Neuordnung des polnischen Korridors und die Garantie gewisser Rechte für die deutsche Minderheit in Polen¹⁹⁵.

Friedländer interpretiert alles dies in folgendem Sinne: „... der Heilige Stuhl sagt während der letzten Wochen der ... Krise der Diplomatie des Reiches seine Unterstützung zu“¹⁹⁶.“ Anders ausgedrückt, der Papst handelte aus der Sorge heraus, die deutsche Diplomatie zu unterstützen, nicht aber in dem Bestreben, zwischen

¹⁹⁴ Die Ansprache findet sich in den *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, Bonne Presse, Bd. I, S. 128. Ihr Text soll hier nicht wiedergegeben werden. Es genügt, daß der Leser über Zweck und Bedeutung dieser Ansprache im Bilde ist.

¹⁹⁵ Telegramm Osbornes, des britischen Gesandten beim Vatikan, an Lord Halifax vom 30. August. Zitiert bei Friedländer, *Pius XII.*, S. 33, nach *Documents on British Foreign Policy*, Third Series VII, S. 403 f. Ferner *Journal du Comte polonais Szembeck*, Plon, Paris, S. 499

¹⁹⁶ Friedländer, *Pius XII.*, S. 30

Deutschland und Polen eine territoriale Neuordnung und eine Regelung über das Schicksal der deutschen Minderheit in Polen herbeizuführen, das heißt, eine vernünftigeren Regelung als die in Versailles festgelegte, die die Ursache des deutsch-polnischen Konfliktes bildete.

Kurz, aus Sympathie für das nationalsozialistische Deutschland.

Es ist immer die gleiche Methode.

Doch wir wollen uns kurz fassen. Aus dem Zeitraum vom Scheitern seines Vermittlungsversuches Anfang Mai bis zum 1. September 1939 ragt ein Ereignis heraus: die öffentliche Mahnung zum Frieden vom 24. August. In diesem „Aufruf an die Regierungen und die Völker“ hieß es: „Nichts ist mit dem Frieden verloren. Mit dem Krieg kann alles verloren sein¹⁹⁷!“

Am folgenden Tag, dem 25. August, unternahmen die Souveräne von Belgien und Holland einen letzten Vermittlungsversuch. Pius XII. schloß sich demselben an, indem er auf „das glückliche Zusammentreffen mit seiner eigenen Rundfunkbotschaft für den Frieden¹⁹⁸“ hinwies.

Die letzte Geste Pius' XII. am Ende dieses Zeitraumes bestand darin, daß er am 31. August 1939 den Botschaftern Deutschlands, Polens, Englands, Frankreichs und Italiens durch Kardinalstaatssekretär Maglione eine Note überreichen ließ, die zwei Punkte enthielt:

1. Für Deutschland und Polen den Vorschlag einer zehn- bis vierzehntägigen Stillhaltepause, für deren Dauer sich die beiden Länder verpflichten sollten, sich jeglicher Maßnahmen und Zwischenfälle zu enthalten, die die Spannung verschärfen könnten.

2. Für alle übrigen Empfänger ein Ersuchen um eine internationale Konferenz, deren Ziel in der Beilegung des deutsch-polnischen Konfliktes sowie einer Revision des Versailler Vertrages bestehen sollte¹⁹⁹.

¹⁹⁷ *Un ora grave in: Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, XXXI, S. 333, und *Documentation catholique*, XL., Col. 1128 (Zitiert nach Papst Pius XII., *Vorkämpfer des Friedens*, S. 12 — Anm. d. Übers.)

¹⁹⁸ *Osservatore Romano*, 26. August

¹⁹⁹ Nach *Documentation catholique*, 1945, Col. 163, wo angegeben wird, daß die Überreichung der Note am 31. August um 13 Uhr erfolgte.

Am Nachmittag dieses 31. August schlug Mussolini Frankreich und Großbritannien eine Viererkonferenz für den 5. September vor. Zuvor hatte er den Grafen Ciano beauftragt, Msgr. Maglione mitzuteilen, daß „Italien den Vorschlag des Papstes mit ganzer Kraft unterstütze²⁰⁰“.

Anlaß dieser beiden Vorschläge war die Tatsache, daß Hitler sich am 29. August zu Verhandlungen bereit erklärt hatte, vorausgesetzt, daß ihm bis zum Abend des 30. August ein mit allen Vollmachten versehener polnischer Unterhändler geschickt würde. Wenn nicht, so bedeute das den Krieg (Quintessenz seiner Erklärungen). Alles deutete nun aber darauf hin, daß die Polen im Bewußtsein der Rückendeckung durch England und Frankreich diesen Bevollmächtigten nicht schicken würden.

In seinem Kommentar zu dem Telegramm, das Bergen am 30. August 1939 von Rom nach Berlin sandte und in dem es hieß, „... daß im Falle des Ausbleibens eines polnischen Unterhändlers in Berlin vielleicht mit einer neuen, und zwar päpstlichen Initiative zu rechnen sei“, zog Friedländer indessen die Folgerung: „Schließlich fand keine päpstliche Initiative in diesem Sinne statt²⁰¹.“ Wie gesagt — ein Professor für Zeitgeschichte am *Institut universitaire des Hautes Études internationales* in Genf ... Eine einzige Frage hierzu: Erfolgte seine Ernennung auf Grund von Diplomen oder genügte schon die Vorlage seines Taufscheins?

²⁰⁰ Zitiert bei Duclos, *Le Vatican*, S. 110, nach *Civiltà Catholica*, Rom, v. 15. Juni 1945

²⁰¹ Friedländer, *Pius XII.*, S. 35

III. DIE BEMÜHUNGEN PIUS' XII. UM DIE BEENDIGUNG DES KRIEGES

Und dann kam der Krieg . . .

Die erste Stellungnahme Pius' XII., die öffentlich bekannt wurde, datiert vom 14. September 1939. Es handelt sich um seine Antwort an den neuen Botschafter Belgiens, der ihm an jenem Tage sein Beglaubigungsschreiben überreichte:

„Wir brauchen nicht zu wiederholen, wie sehr Wir bis zum letzten Augenblick vor dem Ausbruch der Feindseligkeiten nichts unversucht gelassen haben, was in Unserer Macht lag — sei es durch Gebete und öffentliche Ermahnungen, sei es durch wiederholte und unmißverständliche vertrauliche Demarchen, um die Menschen über die Größe der Gefahr aufzuklären und sie zu ehrlichen und friedlichen Verhandlungen zu veranlassen . . .“

Sodann folgte der Satz, der seine Haltung während des ganzen Krieges kennzeichnete:

„ . . . Wir werden nicht aufhören, aufmerksam nach allen etwaigen Gelegenheiten, durch die die heute aufgewiegelten und entzweiten Völker erneut zum Abschluß eines für alle gerechten und ehrenvollen Friedens hingeführt werden könnten, Ausschau zu halten, um sie mit Unserer ganzen Macht zu unterstützen²⁰².“

Eines „für alle gerechten und ehrenvollen Friedens“, nicht aber einer Rückkehr zum Status quo.

Friedländer bemerkt hierzu: „Selbstverständlich muß ein Friede, der nicht von einer Rückkehr zum *Status quo* . . . ausgeht, den Deutschen in die Hände spielen²⁰³.“ Folglich muß man sich also vor einer Rückkehr zu einem „für alle gerechten und ehrenvollen Frieden“ hüten. Bedenkt man jedoch, daß Hitler und der Zweite Weltkrieg kamen, eben weil der Versailler Vertrag keinen „für alle gerechten und ehrenvollen Frieden“ geschaffen hatte — ins-

²⁰² *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, XXXI, S. 367, und *Documentation catholique*, XL, Col. 1130. Die Hervorhebung des zweiten Teiles des Zitates wurde von uns vorgenommen. P. R.

²⁰³ Friedländer, *Pius XII.*, S. 37

besondere nicht für die Deutschen —, so können einen die Motive, die den Gedankengängen Friedländers zugrunde liegen, nur erschrecken. Also niemals einen gerechten Frieden für die Deutschen? Und das ihnen 1919 zugefügte Unrecht wiedergutmachen hieße nur „ihnen in die Hände spielen“, nicht aber, gerechte Verhältnisse wiederherstellen? Dann könnte man ebensogut auf der Stelle festsetzen, das Bemühen um Gerechtigkeit sei kein sittliches Gebot.

Derartiges Gerede hält einer Prüfung nicht stand. Pius XII., der es, wenn auch in weniger deutlicher Form, aus dem Mund der Diplomaten der Alliierten vernahm, hat sich im übrigen niemals damit aufgehalten. Seine erste Enzyklika *Summi Pontificatus* vom 20. Oktober folgte einer Richtschnur, die er in seiner Antwort vom 14. September an den belgischen Botschafter festgelegt hatte: einer Stellungnahme für die Rückkehr zum Frieden, die überdies den Ausspruch Pius' XI.: „Geistig gesehen, sind wir alle Semiten“ durch die Worte: „Da heißt es nicht mehr Heide oder Jude . . .“ wieder aufgriff, was ein wenig zu sehr in Vergessenheit geraten ist. Seine Enzyklika spiegelte diesen Standpunkt so deutlich, daß sie im Lager der Alliierten sogleich als eine „Charta der internationalen Moral“ begrüßt wurde.

Bei zahlreichen anderen Gelegenheiten bekräftigte Pius XII. diesen grundsätzlichen Standpunkt erneut:

In seiner Weihnachtsbotschaft 1939, in der alle die Punkte zusammengefaßt waren, die seiner Ansicht nach die rechtlichen und politischen Voraussetzungen für einen gerechten und dauerhaften Frieden bildeten²⁰⁴.

In seinem Schreiben vom 7. Januar 1940 an Präsident Roosevelt, mit dem er dessen Brief erwiderte, den er am 24. Dezember 1939 erhalten hatte und in dem Roosevelt ihm neben der Abreise seines Sonderbeauftragten Myron Taylor seine Absicht ankündigte, „die Unterstützung der drei großen Religionen [zu suchen], um der Welt im geeigneten Augenblick die Grundlagen für einen dauerhaften Frieden anzubieten“.

²⁰⁴ *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, XXXII, S. 509

In der Antwort Pius' XII. auf dieses Schreiben hieß es: „Nichts konnte Uns zu Weihnachten willkommener sein als diese Nachricht, denn sie stellt ... einen wichtigen Beitrag dar zu Unseren eigenen Bemühungen um die Schaffung eines gerechten und ehrenvollen Friedens²⁰⁵.“

In seiner Weihnachtsbotschaft vom 24. Dezember 1940, die seine Forderungen für eine Neuordnung enthält²⁰⁶.

In seinem Schreiben vom 20. April 1941 an den Kardinalstaatssekretär, in dem er diesen anwies, öffentliche Gebete für den Frieden zu empfehlen²⁰⁷.

In seiner Antwort vom 17. Juli 1941 an den neuen Botschafter Perus anlässlich der Überreichung des Beglaubigungsschreibens. Thema dieser Antwort ist die soziale Gerechtigkeit als Grundlage des Friedens²⁰⁸.

In seiner Weihnachtsbotschaft vom 24. Dezember 1941, die die Voraussetzungen für einen gerechten und dauerhaften Frieden zum Gegenstand hat²⁰⁹.

In seiner Ansprache vom 13. Mai 1942 (anlässlich seines Bischofsjubiläums) über die Aufgabe der Kirche im Weltkrieg²¹⁰.

In seiner Weihnachtsbotschaft vom 24. Dezember 1942 über die christliche Gesellschaftsordnung²¹¹.

In seiner Ansprache vom 2. Juni 1943 an das Kardinalskollegium, deren Thema ein Protest gegen den totalen Krieg ist²¹².

²⁰⁵ Ebd., XXXII, S. 43 f., sowie *Wartime Correspondence between President Roosevelt und Pope Pius XII.*, 7. Januar 1940

²⁰⁶ *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, XXXIII, S. 5 ff.

²⁰⁷ Ebd., XXXIII, S. 110–112

²⁰⁸ Ebd., XXXIII, S. 356–358

²⁰⁹ Ebd., XXXIV, S. 10 ff.

²¹⁰ Ebd., XXXIV, S. 154 ff

²¹¹ Ebd., XXXV, S. 9 ff.

²¹² Ebd., XXXV, S. 165 ff.

In seiner Ansprache vom 13. Juni 1943 an die italienischen Arbeiter, die eine Entgegnung auf die Verleumdungen der Friedensbemühungen des Heiligen Stuhles darstellt²¹³.

In seiner Botschaft vom 1. September 1943 an die gesamte Welt zum vierten Jahrestag des Kriegsausbruches über das Thema, welchen Zweck es habe, eine solche Geißel zu verlängern²¹⁴.

In seiner Weihnachtsbotschaft vom 24. Dezember 1943 über die Grundsätze eines Programmes für einen gerechten und dauerhaften Frieden²¹⁵.

In seiner Botschaft vom 1. September 1944 an die gesamte Welt zum fünften Jahrestag des Kriegsausbruches. Diese Botschaft enthält eine Reihe von Erwägungen für die Zukunft über den Aufbau der Gesellschaft sowie über Wirtschaftsprobleme²¹⁶.

In seiner Weihnachtsbotschaft vom 24. Dezember 1944 über die wahre Demokratie und die Voraussetzungen, unter denen eine internationale Organisation den Frieden in wirksamer Weise garantieren kann²¹⁷.

Wir haben es nicht für notwendig erachtet, aus diesen verschiedenen Schriften die Stellen anzuführen, die das Bemühen des Papstes zeigen, zwischen Völkern und Staatsmännern ein für die Wiederaufnahme der internationalen Beziehungen psychologisch günstiges Klima zu schaffen. Doch wird sich der Leser leicht an Hand der angegebenen Quellen darüber informieren können.

Der gleichen Sorge des Papstes um die Abkürzung des Krieges entsprang das, was wir aus den Worten der viel zuwenig bekannten amerikanischen Historikerin Anne Armstrong erfahren:

„ ... Papst Pius XII. warnte im Juni 1944 Präsident Roosevelt

²¹³ Ebd., XXXV, S. 171 f.

²¹⁴ Ebd., XXXV, S. 277—279

²¹⁵ Ebd., XXXVI, S. 11 ff.

²¹⁶ Ebd., XXXVI, S. 249 ff.

²¹⁷ Ebd., XXXVII, S. 10 ff.

durch dessen Abgesandten Myron Taylor: Der Friedenstempel werde nur dann dauernden Bestand haben, wenn er auf der Basis christlicher Nächstenliebe gegründet sei, nicht aber, wenn leidenschaftliche Sucht nach Vergeltung oder irgendwelche Elemente des Hasses die Bausteine seien. Der Papst sagte zu Taylor, er halte die Forderung nach bedingungsloser Kapitulation für unvereinbar mit der christlichen Glaubenslehre²¹⁸.“

Mit der Vernunft und dem schlichten, gesunden Menschenverstand ist sie ebenso unvereinbar: Es gibt heutzutage kaum noch einen Menschen, den die bekannten Tatsachen nicht überzeugt haben, daß diese Forderung den Krieg um mindestens zwei Jahre verlängert hat.

Doch sehen wir nun, welche praktischen Folgerungen Pius XII. aus diesen immer wieder bekräftigten Grundsätzen gezogen hat, das heißt, zu welchen diplomatischen Interventionen er sich dadurch veranlaßt fühlte. Es zeigt sich, daß wir sowohl seine Interventionen zugunsten der Nichtausweitung des Krieges als auch diejenigen, die er in Hinblick auf die Wiederherstellung des Weltfriedens unternahm, in zwei Gruppen einteilen müssen: in jene, die durch unwiderlegbare Texte, und in jene, die nur durch Äußerungen mehr oder weniger qualifizierter Zeugen verbürgt sind.

Zur erstgenannten Gruppe gehören seine vielfältigen Interventionen, durch die er den Kriegseintritt Italiens zu verhindern suchte. „Neun Monate lang“, sagt Duclos, „verging keine Woche, in der der Papst nicht direkt — in einer Ansprache, einem Schreiben, einer Audienz — oder indirekt — durch Vermittlung seines Staatssekretärs, seiner Nuntien oder durch halboffizielle Persönlichkeiten — auf die italienische Öffentlichkeit und die verantwortlichen Führer, insbesondere auf Ciano, eingewirkt hätte²¹⁹.“

Und das ist durchaus zutreffend.

Nachstehend einige der wichtigsten Beweise:

Nachdem man am 4. September in *Il Popolo d'Italia* hatte lesen können, „daß Italien bei dem [von Hitler unternommenen] Wie-

²¹⁸ Anne Armstrong, *Bedingungslose Kapitulation, die teuerste Fehlentscheidung der Neuzeit*, S. 278

²¹⁹ Duclos, *Le Vatican*, S. 111

deraufbau und der Befreiung des neuen Europas auf keinen Fall abseits stehen werde“, ließ Pius XII. am 6. September Mussolini durch Pater Tacchi Venturi die Mahnung überbringen, er möge sich mit allen ihm zur Verfügung stehenden Mitteln für den Frieden einsetzen.

Am 20. Oktober hieß es in der Enzyklika *Summi Pontificatus*: „Das ist Unser Gebet zum Herrn, daß dieser Friede wie heiteres Himmelsblau das Gemüt des italienischen Volkes durchziehe, belebe, weite und machtvoll stärke²²⁰.“

Am 7. Dezember gab er anlässlich des Empfanges des neuen italienischen Botschafters beim Vatikan, Alfieri, seiner Überzeugung Ausdruck, „daß seine Friedensbemühungen in dem mutigen, starken und arbeitsamen italienischen Volk, das durch die Besonnenheit seiner Führer sowie durch sein eigenes innerstes Gefühl bisher vor dem Krieg bewahrt blieb, stets ein getreues Echo finden würden²²¹“.

Im Dezember bahnten sich neue Beziehungen zwischen dem König von Italien, der die Neutralität dieses Landes befürwortete, und dem Papst an. Vermittler hierbei war Graf Ciano, der die gleiche Ansicht vertrat. Am 21. Dezember wurde das italienische Königspaar in Begleitung des Grafen Ciano im Vatikan empfangen, was seit dem Konkordat von 1929 nicht mehr vorgekommen war. In seiner Ansprache gab der Papst dem Wunsch Ausdruck, „daß Gott dem italienischen Volk bei vorausschauender Wachsamkeit und versöhnlicher Weisheit nicht nur seinen inneren und äußeren Frieden schenken, sondern auch die Wiederherstellung eines ehrenvollen und dauerhaften Friedens unter den Völkern gewähren möge²²²“. Am 28. Dezember stattete der Papst dem König einen Gegenbesuch ab — den ersten Besuch eines Papstes im Quirinal seit 70 Jahren — und äußerte sich dort in ähnlicher Weise.

²²⁰ Zitiert nach Papst Pius XII., *Reden*, S. 139 (Anm. d. Übers.)

²²¹ *Actes de Pie XII*, Bonne Presse, Bd. I, S. 297

²²² Ebd., S. 311

Am 17. März fand eine Begegnung zwischen Hitler und Mussolini am Brenner statt, aus der der Duce als Abhängiger Hitlers hervorging. Als der *Osservatore Romano* eine Kampagne für den Frieden startete, wurde Botschafter Alfieri am 9. April von Mussolini beauftragt, Protest dagegen zu erheben. Msgr. Maglione erteilte dem Botschafter daraufhin folgende Antwort: „Der *Osservatore Romano* wird zwar in Italienisch gedruckt, ist aber das Organ des Heiligen Stuhls. Er darf nicht mit den italienischen Zeitungen gleichgestellt werden ... Es muß überall, vor allem aber im Ausland, ersichtlich sein, daß er wirklich das Blatt des Heiligen Stuhls, das heißt unparteiisch und lauter ist²²³.“

Am 24. April richtete er ein persönliches Schreiben an den Duce, in dem es hieß: „Der Heilige Vater äußert aus tiefstem Herzen den heißen Wunsch, daß Europa weitere Verheerungen und noch mehr Leid und insbesondere unserem lieben Vaterland, Ihrem Land, ein derartiges Elend erspart werden mögen²²⁴.“ Die Beziehungen verschlechterten sich ... Der Papst versteifte sich auf seine grundsätzlichen Auffassungen.

Und dann ereignete sich jener wohlbekannte Vorfall vom 13. Mai 1940: Botschafter Alfieri war beauftragt worden, beim Heiligen Stuhl erneut vorstellig zu werden. Gegenstand der Kritik war die Friedenskampagne des *Osservatore Romano*, zu der dieses Mal eine am 5. Mai in der Basilika Santa Maria sopra Minerva gehaltene päpstliche Ansprache, die einen eindringlichen Appell an das Volk zugunsten der Neutralität Italiens darstellte, der Anlaß war, ferner waren es drei Telegramme des Papstes an die Souveräne Belgiens, Luxemburgs und der Niederlande, in denen er die Invasion dieser Länder verurteilte. „Der Heilige Vater“, sagt Alfieri²²⁵, „erwiderte mir, er begreife den Unwillen des Regierungschefs nicht ... Es komme, was da mag, schloß er mit ruhiger Bestimmtheit, und wenn sie mich eines Tages verhaften und in ein Konzentrationsla-

²²³ *Documentation catholique*, 1945, Col. 523

²²⁴ Ebd.

²²⁵ Dino Alfieri, *Deux dictateurs face à face*, S. 30 f. (Zitiert nach Friedländer, *Pius XII.*, S. 47 — Anm. d. Übers.)

ger bringen. Jeder muß seine eigenen Taten einmal vor Gott verantworten.“

Man weiß, daß Mussolini sich damals bereits unwiderruflich für ein Eingreifen in den Konflikt entschieden hatte. Pius XII. mußte am 2. Juni vor dem Kardinalskollegium seine Ohnmacht eingestehen. Am 10. Juni erklärte Italien Frankreich den Krieg.

Gegenüber dem Kriegseintritt Deutschlands gegen Rußland, sodann Japans gegen die Vereinigten Staaten und als Folge davon schließlich auch Deutschlands gegen die Vereinigten Staaten besaß Pius XII. weitaus schlechtere, wenn nicht gar keine Interventionsmöglichkeiten. Im einen wie im anderen Fall wurde er vor die vollendete Tatsache gestellt. Immerhin weigerte er sich nachzugeben: Er fand sich ebensowenig zu einem Kreuzzug gegen den Nationalsozialismus bereit, der von den Alliierten ununterbrochen gefordert wurde, wie zu einem Kreuzzug gegen den Bolschewismus, der ebenso ununterbrochen von den Achsenmächten gefordert wurde, was im einen wie im anderen Fall einem Kriegseintritt zugunsten der einen oder der anderen Seite gleichgekommen wäre.

Auch hierfür liegen beweiskräftige Texte vor:

„Radio Moskau konnte im Jahre 1943 melden, Pius XII. habe ein Zusammengehen mit Hitler in einem Kreuzzug gegen die Sowjetunion abgelehnt“, sagte der *Osservatore Romano* vom 16. Januar 1945. Diese Erklärung ist niemals dementiert worden.

Wir hören es auch von Pius XII. selbst:

„Wir haben Uns im besonderen gehütet, obwohl man Uns in dieser Hinsicht unter einen gewissen Druck setzte, Uns mündlich oder schriftlich auch nur mit einem einzigen Wort, einem einzigen Zeichen der Billigung oder der Ermutigung, zugunsten des 1941 gegen Rußland begonnenen Krieges zu äußern²²⁶.“

Man darf das wohl glauben, denn Friedländer selbst gibt diese Tatsache zu²²⁷. Gleichzeitig behauptet er allerdings, daß diese Haltung Pius' XII. lediglich von seiner Sympathie für das nationalsozialistische Deutschland, das einzige Bollwerk gegen den Bolsche-

²²⁶ Feierliche Erklärung an das diplomatische Korps vom 15. Juni 1946 (*Documentation catholique*, 1946, Col. 205)

²²⁷ Friedländer, *Pius XII.*, S. 124

²²⁸ Vgl. oben S. 53

wismus, bestimmt gewesen sei. Wahrhaftig, ein Musterbeispiel für einen Widerspruch²²⁸!

Im September 1941 schickten die bis dahin neutralen Angelsachsen sich an, die Russen zu unterstützen. Am 9. überreichte Myron Taylor Pius XII. ein Schreiben mit Datum vom 3. September, durch das Roosevelt den Papst über die Gründe für diese Entscheidung unterrichtete. So sei die russische Diktatur für die Sicherheit der anderen Nationen weniger gefährlich als die deutsche Diktatur und die nationalsozialistischen Verbrechen. Es folgt ein Grund, der den Papst dazu veranlassen sollte, die amerikanischen Katholiken aufzufordern, denselben Weg einzuschlagen wie ihr Präsident, das heißt, der Pius XII. veranlassen sollte, mit eigenem Beispiel dabei voranzugehen und dies auch vor der amerikanischen Öffentlichkeit zu vertreten: der Grund nämlich, daß, nachdem soeben mit Genehmigung der Regierung in Moskau ein orthodoxer Patriarch gewählt und eine Wiederaufnahme der Gottesdienste gestattet worden war, sich die religiöse Situation in Rußland gebessert habe. Der Papst lehnte jedoch das Ersuchen ab. Taylor berichtete: „Seine Heiligkeit bestätigte, daß der Heilige Stuhl den atheistischen Kommunismus und die totalitären Systeme verdamme, daß er jedoch das russische Volk weiterhin mit einer ganz väterlichen Zuneigung betrachte.“ In seiner Weihnachtsbotschaft 1941 bestätigte er diese Weigerung, in dem von Roosevelt gewünschten Sinne Stellung zu nehmen, in allgemeiner Form: „Wir lieben, dessen ist Gott Zeuge, mit gleicher Liebe alle Völker ohne irgendeine Ausnahme; um auch nur den Anschein des Parteigeistes zu vermeiden, haben wir Uns bis jetzt die größte Zurückhaltung auferlegt²²⁹.“

Nun wird auch deutlich, welchen Sinn man dem Wort „Zurückhaltung“, von dem die Gegner des Pazifisten Pius XII. soviel Aufhebens gemacht haben, in diesem Zusammenhang zu geben hat. Der deutsche Botschafter in Madrid hatte zweifellos recht, als er schrieb: „Der Papst habe hierfür [für das Verhalten Roosevelts] kein großes Verständnis gezeigt und erneut betont, daß die Ausdehnung des Krieges das größte Verhängnis sein würde; er freue

²²⁹ Der vollständige Wortlaut des oben zitierten Textes findet sich in den *Actes de Pie XII.*, Bonne Presse, Bd. III. (Zitiert nach Papst Pius XII., *Reden*, S. 62 f. — Anm. d. Übers.)

sich, daß die USA trotz dem allen noch neutral seien, da sie nur so für die Wiederherstellung des Friedens mit dem Heiligen Stuhl zusammen wirken könnten²³⁰.“ Alle Worte und alle Schriften des Papstes gehen in diese Richtung: Wir glauben das unbestreitbar bewiesen zu haben.

Und wenn Bergen am 11. Dezember schrieb, „in ... vatikanischen Kreisen werde das Verhalten Roosevelts unverhohlen kritisiert. Der Präsident habe sich nicht nur nicht bemüht, die Erweiterung des Krieges auf andere Länder zu verhüten, sondern schließlich auch sein eigenes Land in den Krieg hineinmanövriert²³¹“, so steht außer Zweifel, daß er mit dieser Darstellungsweise dem Heiligen Stuhl eine von ihm persönlich gehegte Ansicht unterstellte, doch hatte er unbestreitbar recht. Tatsächlich nämlich hatte Roosevelt sich „nicht bemüht, die Erweiterung des Krieges auf andere Länder zu verhüten“, und „auch sein eigenes Land in den Krieg hineinmanövriert“. Seine Handelspolitik gegenüber Japan beweist das in reichem Maße. Der Inhalt seines Schreibens an Pius XII. vom 3. September 1941 ist ein Geständnis, da ja nicht die geringste Provokation seitens Deutschlands vorlag. Man kann sich nur wundern, daß er trotz dieses Manövrierens dennoch am darauffolgenden 7. Dezember durch Pearl Harbor überrascht und genau wie der Papst vor die vollendete Tatsache gestellt wurde.

Friedländer äußerte seine Ansicht zu dieser ganzen Angelegenheit, indem er die am 21. März 1942 vom deutschen Botschafter Bergen an die Wilhelmstraße übermittelten Informationen hervorhob:

„Wie ich geheim erfahre, hat Heiliger Stuhl, anscheinend auf Betreiben italienischer Regierung, tatsächlich durch seine diplomatischen Vertreter auf die an Konferenz von Rio de Janeiro beteiligten Länder (d. h. die südamerikanischen Staaten, die Roosevelt zum Abbruch ihrer diplomatischen Beziehungen zu den Achsenmächten und Japan zu veranlassen suchte) im Sinne Beibehaltung Neutralität vor Zusammentritt Konferenz eingewirkt. Durch Meldung *United Press* habe er sich jedoch zu Dementi durch Apostoli-

²³⁰ Zitiert bei Friedländer, *Pius XII.*, S. 68

²³¹ Ebd., S. 69

schen Delegaten in Washington gezwungen gesehen, um Vorwurf Einmischung oder Parteinahme zu vermeiden²³².“

Daß die apostolischen Nuntien in Südamerika wie Pius XII. selbst gegen eine Ausweitung des Krieges waren, ist selbstverständlich. Daß sie ebenso wenig wie der Papst ein Hehl daraus machten, ist ebenso selbstverständlich. Aber dann gleich von „Einwirken“ zu reden, dazu gehört doch wesentlich mehr, daher auch das Dementi. Daß Pius XII. schließlich „auf Betreiben [der] italienischen Regierung“ gehandelt und sich ihr gefügt haben soll, das übersteigt nun wirklich das Begriffsvermögen, wenn man sich nur vergegenwärtigt, mit welcher Festigkeit er den Vorhaltungen begegnete, die ihm seitens des Duce gemacht wurden²³³.

Wenn der deutsche Botschafter seiner Regierung eine derartige Mitteilung machte, um eine Erklärung für einen Mißerfolg abzugeben, dann mag das noch hingehen. Wenn Friedländer diese Darstellung jedoch als bare Münze ausgibt, so ist das ganz einfach eine Unterstellung, die im übrigen seiner Manier entspricht, denn seine gesamte Abhandlung besteht ja aus nichts anderem.

Bei dieser wie bei allen anderen Gelegenheiten verhielt Pius XII. sich so, weil er gegen die Ausweitung des Krieges war, nicht aber, um dem Duce eine Freude zu machen. Weil er um die Wiederherstellung des Friedens bemüht war, verhielt er sich so, und weil eine Ausweitung des Krieges auf noch unbeteiligte Länder niemals der beste Weg zu diesem Ziel ist.

IV. DIE DIPLOMATISCHEN BEMÜHUNGEN DES VATIKANS

Auf der Ebene der Praxis, das heißt der Diplomatie, bleibt nun lediglich noch zu zeigen, in welcher Weise Pius XII., nachdem er sich bemüht hatte, eine Ausweitung des Krieges zu verhindern, gemäß seinen eigenen Worten „nach allen . . . Gelegenheiten, durch die die . . . Völker . . . zum Abschluß eines gerechten und für alle ehrenvollen Friedens hingeführt werden könnten, Ausschau“ hielt und wie er sie nutzte.

²³² Telegramm Bergens an Berlin vom 21. März 1942, zitiert bei Friedländer, *Pius XII.*, S. 70

²³³ Vgl. oben S. 142

Eines muß zunächst eingeräumt werden: Niemals, obgleich er nicht aufhörte, es zu wünschen und zu erhoffen, erhielt er — wie Benedikt XV. während des Ersten Weltkrieges — die Gelegenheit, während des Zweiten Weltkrieges eine diplomatische Friedensoffensive einzuleiten. Er konnte höchstens versuchen, die Parteien miteinander in Kontakt zu bringen. Welche Gelegenheiten sich ihm dazu boten, soll nachstehend in chronologischer Reihenfolge dargelegt werden:

1. Nachdem der Polenfeldzug zu Hitlers Vorteil beendet worden war, ersuchte dieser Mussolini, der immer noch neutral war und sich daher in einer günstigeren Position befand, Sondierungen für einen Kompromißfrieden vorzunehmen, der auf ein Polen ohne deutsche, ukrainische und litauische Minderheiten abzielte. Der Duce tat daraufhin zweierlei: Einerseits beauftragte er Mitte September *Il Popolo d'Italia* mit der Veröffentlichung einer Artikelserie, durch die England und Frankreich gedrängt werden sollten, einem Kompromiß auf dieser Grundlage zuzustimmen. Andererseits ersuchte er den Grafen Ciano, seinen Außenminister, Pius XII. die Bitte übermitteln zu lassen, seinen Einfluß in London und Paris für einen solchen Friedensvorschlag geltend zu machen. Die beste Darstellung der Bedingungen dieses Kompromisses erfolgte am 22. September in einem Artikel des *Osservatore Romano*. Diese Veröffentlichung stellt allein schon einen unbestreitbaren Beweis dafür dar, daß Pius XII. einem Friedensvorschlag in dieser Form positiv gegenüberstand. Im übrigen war es ein sehr annehmbarer Vorschlag, denn wäre er wirksam geworden, hätte das bedeutet, da Rußland sich nicht im Kriegszustand befand, daß der Frieden wiedergewonnen gewesen wäre.

Hitler hielt daraufhin am nachfolgenden 8. Oktober im Reichstag eine Rede, die einen Vorschlag für einen allgemeinen Frieden darstellte: keine Kriegsabsichten gegen Frankreich und England, mit Ausnahme der Kolonien keine Revisionsforderungen hinsichtlich des Versailler Vertrages mehr, einen selbständigen polnischen Staat nach Regelung des Problems der europäischen Minderheiten im Rahmen einer allgemeinen Konferenz, Regelung der Judenfrage, Abrüstung, europäische Zusammenarbeit ... Nichts darunter, was nicht recht und billig gewesen wäre. Der Vorschlag war

noch präziser und damit noch annehmbarer als der in den Artikeln des *Il Popolo d'Italia*.

Zwei Autoren, Duclos und Mourin, behaupten, ohne jedoch ein Datum dafür anzugeben, Msgr. Maglione, der Staatssekretär des Vatikans, habe die Nuntien in Paris und London beauftragt, den beiden Regierungen eine in diesem Sinne abgefaßte päpstliche Botschaft zu überreichen. Der erste Verfasser spricht von einem „Angebot der guten Dienste“ und charakterisiert dies folgendermaßen: „Der Papst begnügt sich damit, seinem Wunsch nach einer Wiederherstellung des Friedens in Europa Ausdruck zu geben, und rät den beiden Nationen, die erste Gelegenheit zur Erreichung dieses Zieles wahrzunehmen²³⁴.“ Und der zweite erklärt: „Die Intervention des Vatikans blieb vage und vorsichtig. Er wollte vermeiden, daß eine zu deutliche Stellungnahme die Katholiken der kriegführenden Länder in einen Gewissenskonflikt brächte²³⁵.“ Aus den vom Verlag Bonne Presse herausgegebenen *Actes de Pie XII*²³⁶ schließlich erfahren wir zum Thema der diplomatischen Interventionen folgendes:

„Auf dem üblichen offiziellen Wege übernahm es Pius XII. (Ende 1939/Anfang 1940) auf Ersuchen einflußreicher politischer und militärischer Kreise Deutschlands, der anderen kriegführenden Partei einige Fragen bezüglich der Kriegsziele und Friedensbedingungen zu übermitteln“ und ferner: „Das Eingreifen des Papstes [man ergänze: in den Krieg] beschränkte sich auf diese Übermittlung.“

Damit gelangt man zu der Schlußfolgerung, daß es sich um jene Art von sondierenden Noten handelte, die in der Diplomatie des Vatikans Tradition sind. Mit anderen Worten: Bevor er seine „guten Dienste“ anbot, wollte Pius XII. zunächst einmal wissen, welche Aussichten auf Erfolg sein Vorschlag haben würde.

Er hatte keine. Von der Rednertribüne des Unterhauses herab erscholl am 12. Oktober durch die Stimme Chamberlains die Antwort auf die Friedensvorschläge Hitlers: „Der gegenwärtigen deutschen Regierung kann keinerlei Vertrauen entgegengebracht werden.“ Am Tage darauf, dem 13. Oktober, zog Hitler den Schluß

²³⁴ Duclos, *Le Vatican*, S. 121

²³⁵ Mourin, *Les Tentatives de paix dans la Seconde Guerre mondiale*, S. 21

²³⁶ Bd. I, S. 32

daraus, „daß Chamberlain sich durch die Ablehnung seines Friedensangebotes mit voller Überlegung für den Krieg entschieden habe“.

Die päpstliche Initiative fand damit ihr Ende: Es bestand für Pius XII. kein Grund mehr, seine guten Dienste anzubieten.

2. Am 7. November 1939 boten die Königin der Niederlande und der König der Belgier den Kriegführenden ihre Vermittlung an. Die Könige von Dänemark, Norwegen, Schweden und Rumänien sowie der Präsident der finnischen Republik unterstützten den Schritt. Der Vatikan ebenfalls²³⁷.

3. Wie oben erwähnt, richtete er im Namen der Deutschen eine Anfrage an die andere kriegführende Partei nach deren Kriegszielen und Friedensbedingungen.

4. Am 11. März 1940 soll Ribbentrop, nach Camille Cianfarra, im Verlauf seines Besuches in Rom, von dem bereits die Rede war²³⁸, Pius XII. einen elf Punkte umfassenden Friedensplan unterbreitet und ihn gebeten haben, die Alliierten davon zu unterrichten. Außer den Dementis, die von London, Paris, Berlin und dem Vatikan selbst ausgegeben und von der damaligen Presse veröffentlicht wurden²³⁹ gestattet jedoch nichts die Annahme, daß dieser Plan Pius XII. von Außenminister Ribbentrop tatsächlich unterbreitet wurde.

5. Am 28. Juni 1940, nach der Niederwerfung Frankreichs, überreichte Msgr. Maglione dem deutschen, britischen und italienischen Botschafter beim Heiligen Stuhl folgende Note:

„Tief besorgt in Voraussicht der unzähligen Todesopfer und der nicht wiedergutzumachenden Verheerungen, zu denen das — nunmehr nahe bevorstehende — Wiederaufflammen der Kriegshandlungen führen wird, möchte Heiliger Vater — aus eigener Initiative und in der alleinigen Absicht, sein äußerstes für die Rettung der Menschheit und der Zivilisation anzubieten, überzeugt, daß ein gerechter und ehrenvoller Friede im Wunsche der Völker liege und daß die Verlängerung des Krieges leicht weitere Kämpfe und Krisen nach sich ziehen könnte — sich an Regierungen Deutsch-

²³⁷ François Charles-Roux, *Huit ans au Vatican*, S. 355

²³⁸ Vgl. oben S. 70

²³⁹ Siehe die Zeitungen vom 13. bis 18. März 1940

land, England und Italien wenden mit der Bitte, die Wege der gemeinsamen Verständigung zu versuchen, um zu einer Beendigung des Konflikts zu gelangen. S. Heiligkeit wünscht jedoch vor Einleitung dieses Schrittes, daß Ew. Exzellenz Ihre Regierung vertraulich befragen, welche Aufnahme eine derartige Aufforderung des Papstes bei ihr finden könnte²⁴⁰.“

Am 19. Juli machte Hitler Großbritannien in einer großen Reichstagsrede ein offizielles Friedensangebot. Wie er darin erklärte, habe er weder den Wunsch, Großbritannien zu vernichten, noch die geringste Absicht, das britische Kolonialreich anzutasten. Als Antwort darauf verkündete Lord Halifax am 21. Juli in einer Rundfunkansprache: „Wir werden weiterkämpfen, bis die Freiheit gesichert ist“²⁴¹.“

Am 26. Juli teilte von Weizsäcker, der Staatssekretär im Auswärtigen Amt, dem Nuntius Orsenigo die Antwort des Reiches auf die Botschaft Pius' XII. mit:

„... Wir glaubten schon seit einiger Zeit über eine Antwort aus London auf die Sondierung der Kurie in der Friedensfrage so weit unterrichtet zu sein, daß die englische Haltung als eine negative betrachtet werden müsse.

Die deutsche Äußerung zu der Sondierung der Kurie sei nun ja faktisch mit der Rede des Führers vom 19. d. M. gegeben. Die Antwort von Lord Halifax in seiner Radioansprache vom 21. bestätige vollauf unsere Ansicht von der Halsstarrigkeit der britischen Regierung. Offenbar wolle England eben den Krieg, den es dann mit all seinen Schrecken haben würde²⁴².“ Der Nuntius bemerkte daraufhin, „nun sei eben wohl nichts mehr zu wollen. Zur Eheschließung gehörten immer zwei“²⁴².“

Pius XII. sah infolgedessen von einer offiziellen Intervention ab.

6. Paul Duclos macht uns mit Angaben bekannt, die ihm die Familie des verstorbenen Dr. Domenico Russo, der erklärter Antifaschist und Präsident des italienischen Befreiungskomitees war, mitgeteilt habe. Russo, ein leidenschaftlicher Kämpfer für den Frie-

²⁴⁰ *Actes de Pie XII.*, Bonne Presse, XXXII, S. 298, zitiert bei Friedländer, *Pius XII.*, S. 52

²⁴¹ Zitiert bei Friedländer, *Pius XII.*, S. 53

²⁴² Aufzeichnung Weizsäckers v. 26. Juli 1940, zitiert bei Friedländer, *Pius XII.*, S. 53 f.

den, war befreundet mit Francesco Nitti, Msgr. Maglione und einer (nicht namentlich erwähnten) Persönlichkeit aus der Umgebung Hitlers. Diesen Auskünften nach sollen sich Msgr. Maglione und Dr. Domenico Russo im August 1942 einig geworden sein, daß man es vielleicht bei Hitler durchsetzen könnte, einer Initiative des Papstes zugunsten einer Einstellung der Kampfhandlungen und einer allgemeinen Konferenz zuzustimmen. Russo habe daraufhin Erkundigungen eingezogen, und im Oktober habe ihm jene nicht näher bezeichnete Persönlichkeit im Auftrage Hitlers für den Heiligen Stuhl folgende Auskunft erteilt: „Trotz des mir seitens des Papstes zugefügten Unrechts bin ich, wenn der Papst sich für den Frieden einsetzen will, bereit, mich mit dem Heiligen Stuhl ins Einvernehmen zu setzen.“ Bevor jedoch die Antwort des Vatikans erfolgt sei, habe die Landung der Amerikaner in Nordafrika am 8. November 1942 alles wieder in Frage gestellt. Dr. Russo habe seine Bemühungen über die Schweiz und später über Portugal wiederaufgenommen. Dort sei es ihm über einen seiner Freunde gelungen, mit dem Foreign Office in Verbindung zu treten, das ihm am 22. Juni 1943 die folgende Antwort habe zuteil werden lassen: „Wenn der Staatssekretär des Heiligen Stuhls an unseren dortigen Gesandten, Sir Osborne, die Frage richtet, ob England bereit sei, eine päpstliche Vermittlung anzunehmen, wird Sir Osborne beauftragt sein, die Anfrage zu bejahen“. Dr. Russo soll jedoch erst am 10. Juli 1943, dem Tag, an dem die Alliierten in Sizilien landeten, nach Rom zurückgekehrt sein. „So kommt es“, fügt Duclos hinzu, „daß der britische Gesandte Sir Osborne, als Kardinal Maglione ihm die vereinbarte Frage stellt, antwortet, die Weisungen, die er erhalten hätte, seien nicht mehr gültig²⁴³.“

Was soll man von all dem halten? Es ist sicher, daß Pius XII. ein nicht weiter präziertes Ersuchen Hitlers, Schritte „zugunsten einer Einstellung der Kampfhandlungen und einer allgemeinen Konferenz“ zu unternehmen, nur hätte ablehnen können, indem er sich zu allen seinen früheren Äußerungen in Widerspruch setzte. War ein solcher Vorschlag von Hitler geplant, und hat er ihn so formuliert, daß Dr. Russo daraufhin seine Bemühungen bis zu der

²⁴³ Duclos, *Le Vatican*, S. 124

Frage Msgr. Magliones an Sir Osborne gehen ließ? Möglich ist es, aber nicht sicher: Es gibt keinerlei Bestätigung hierfür außer den Memoiren des Chefs der deutschen Abwehr, Schellenberg²⁴⁴, in denen ohne irgendwelche Namensnennungen von Friedensverhandlungen mit den Alliierten berichtet wird, die durch die Vermittlung der Schweiz, des Vatikans und Portugals geführt worden seien und denen sich auch Himmler angeschlossen habe, die jedoch auf Grund der Landung der Amerikaner in Nordafrika am 8. November 1942 sowie der der Engländer und Amerikaner in Sizilien am 10. Juli 1943 gescheitert seien. Handelt es sich um die gleichen Verhandlungen? Auf alle Fälle scheinen die letzteren ohne Wissen Hitlers geführt worden zu sein, und wenn dieser nun seinerseits die gleichen Personen die gleichen Schritte hätte unternehmen lassen, dann müßte man zugeben, daß er in eine Falle gegangen wäre.

Alle diese Zusammenhänge sind sehr dunkel. Sie könnten, falls die Auskünfte, die Paul Duclos von der Familie Dr. Domenico Russos gegeben wurden, zutreffend sind, allerhöchstens eine Vermittlungsbereitschaft des Heiligen Stuhls bezeugen, die auf diplomatischer Ebene jedoch keinerlei Folgen hatte.

7. Es sei hier ferner, wenn auch nur als Randbemerkung, auf ein Schriftstück hingewiesen, das im Falle seiner Echtheit einen Friedensvorschlag Hitlers im März 1943 bezeugen würde: die Protestnote gegen die Verhaftung der römischen Juden, die der österreichische Rektor von *Santa Maria dell'Anima*, Msgr. Hudal, der ein offiziöser Mittelsmann des Vatikans und demzufolge in die geheimsten Dinge eingeweiht war, am 16. Oktober 1943 an den Militärkommandanten von Rom, General Stahel, richtete. In dieser Note heißt es: „Das Reich wird in Kürze für bestimmte Missionen die Hilfe des Vatikans in Anspruch nehmen müssen. Bereits im März wurden Schritte in dieser Richtung unternommen. Es wäre für die Frage des Friedens sehr schade, wenn es auf Grund dieser Judenverfolgung (durch eine Verstimmung des Vatikans) zu einer Meinungsverschiedenheit zwischen dem Vatikan und dem Reich kommen sollte²⁴⁵.“

²⁴⁴ Walter Schellenberg, *Memoiren*

²⁴⁵ Nach Duclos, *Le Vatican*, S. 221

Die Echtheit dieser Note wird durch Hochhuth verbürgt, der das Schreiben in seinem *Stellvertreter* anführt. Sie wird meines Wissens von niemandem bestritten. Wenn man jedoch auf die Quellen zurückgeht, stellt man fest, daß lediglich ein beim Vatikan akkreditierter Journalist, Montefiore, die Note in einem — wie Duclos sagt, noch unveröffentlichten — Manuskript erwähnt. Als Garantie für die Echtheit ist das ziemlich dürftig. Und falls die Note trotz allem authentisch ist, bezeugt sie lediglich eine Demarche Hitlers beim Vatikan, der dieser in keiner Weise stattgab.

8. Schließlich sei noch ein letzter diplomatischer Schritt erwähnt, mit dem F. W. Deakin²⁴⁶ den Vatikan in Verbindung bringt und der so, wie er von jenem Verfasser dargelegt wird, kaum authentisch sein dürfte. Wie F. W. Deakin sagt, seien im Juli 1943 in den politischen Kreisen Italiens viele der Ansicht gewesen, daß der Augenblick gekommen sei, sich um eine politische Lösung für den Krieg zu bemühen, da ihnen jede militärische Lösung ausgeschlossen schien. Das stimmt, denn auch Graf Ciano gehörte zu ihnen, wie aus seinen Tagebüchern hervorgeht. Daß der Duce, wie Deakin hinzufügt, einer derartigen Lösung nicht ablehnend gegenüberstanden habe, selbst wenn sie nur auf eine Trennung Italiens von Deutschland abzielte, ist trotzdem zweifelhaft — mehr als zweifelhaft. Im folgenden sei der zeitliche Ablauf dieser Demarche gezeigt:

Am 17. Juli soll Bastianini, Mussolinis Unterstaatssekretär im Außenministerium, Msgr. Maglione aufgesucht haben, um ihm ein Memorandum zu überreichen, in dem die Situation Italiens gegenüber Deutschland und der Achsenmächte gegenüber den Alliierten im Kriege dargelegt worden sei und das zum Ziel gehabt habe, den Vatikan zu Sondierungen bei den Alliierten zu veranlassen, um ihre Absichten bezüglich Italiens in Erfahrung zu bringen. Da er mit der Zustimmung des Duce rechnete, hoffte er einen Emissär zu den Engländern entsenden zu können. Seine Wahl sei auf den römischen Bankier Luigi Fummi gefallen, der Beziehungen zu dem Pierpont-Morgan-Konzern hatte und Vermögensverwalter des Vatikans war. Plan der Demarche: Fummi

²⁴⁶ F. W. Deakin, *Die brutale Freundschaft*, S. 455 ff.

würde mit einem Diplomatenpaß des Vatikans nach Lissabon reisen und von dort mit einem portugiesischen Visum nach England. In London würde er im Namen Italiens, Rumäniens und Ungarns eine Botschaft von Bastianini Eden persönlich aushändigen. Einverständnis Msgr. Magliones (?). Am 18. Juli: Unterredung Fummi — Duce (?). Am 19. (Datum wird als ungewiß angegeben): Abflug Fummis nach Lissabon. In Lissabon, wo er vergebens auf das britische Visum gewartet haben soll, verliert man seine Spur derart, daß man nicht angeben kann, wann er nach Rom zurückgekehrt ist. Seine Anwesenheit in Lissabon wird angezeigt durch ein Telegramm des deutschen Botschafters in ... Madrid vom 26. Juli.

Der einzige Punkt, über den in dieser Angelegenheit nach der Darstellungsweise F. W. Deakins Gewißheit besteht, ist dieses Telegramm, das sich in den deutschen Archiven befindet. Es ist zumindest verwunderlich, daß es aus Madrid kommt und daß die deutsche Botschaft in Lissabon offenbar nichts davon gewußt hat. Im übrigen soll auf das Telegramm nur deshalb hingewiesen werden, weil darin von Bemühungen des Vatikans die Rede ist, die darauf abzielten, bei den Alliierten einen Sonderfrieden mit Italien allein zu erlangen. Friedländer führt noch drei weitere Telegramme dafür an: Das erste kommt aus Rom²⁴⁷ und ist mit dem Namen Weizsäckers versehen. Es nimmt Bezug auf ein (wie durch Zufall nicht wiederaufgefundenes!) Schreiben des heutigen Papstes Paul VI., des damaligen Kardinals Montini, Unterstaatssekretär im Vatikan, an den deutschen Botschafter, welches Weizsäcker die Schlußfolgerung gestattet: „Daß Italien ‚gut aus dem Krieg herauskommen werde‘, entspricht den Wünschen des Vatikans“ und Friedländer, auch ohne jenen Brief zu kennen, wie er zugibt, die Folgerung erlaubt: „... darf man anscheinend [sic] ... entnehmen, daß der Unterstaatssekretär wahrscheinlich [sic] zu den Kreisen gehörte, die einen separaten Waffenstillstand Italiens für wünschenswert hielten.“ Das zweite kommt von der deutschen Botschaft in Paris²⁴⁸

²⁴⁷ Telegramm Weizsäckers an Berlin vom 3. August 1943, zitiert bei Friedländer, *Pius XII.*, S. 131 f.

²⁴⁸ Telegramm Schleiers (von der deutschen Botschaft in Paris) vom 18. August 1943, zitiert bei Friedländer, *Pius XII.*, S. 133

und behauptet, daß nach den Vorstellungen des Vatikans der Friede mit Italien ein „erster Schritt zu Einigung Angelsachsen mit den Deutschen werden (soll), um europäisch-amerikanisch-christliche Einheitsfront gegen Asien zu schaffen“, ohne daß jedoch ein Beleg dafür gegeben wird. Das dritte stammt ebenfalls von der deutschen Botschaft in Paris²⁴⁹ und behauptet einer Information aus Lissabon zufolge (!), daß „der Papst durch seine Vertreter in England und Amerika die größten Anstrengungen mache, um zu erreichen, daß Italien ein ehrenvoller Friede gewährt würde“. Ein viertes Telegramm, das von der deutschen Botschaft in Paris ausgeht²⁵⁰, unterrichtet Berlin nicht über Anstrengungen des Vatikans zur Erreichung eines Separatfriedens der Westmächte mit Italien, sondern darüber, „daß in den Kreisen des Vatikans eine stärkere Neigung erkennbar wäre, die Achsenmächte und die Anglo-Amerikaner einer Annäherung zum (gemeinsamen) Kampf gegen den Bolschewismus entgegenzuführen²⁵¹“ und daß „der Papst ... mit allen Mitteln bestrebt (sei), Frieden zwischen Deutschland und England anzubahnen“.

Doch man kann keinerlei Werturteil über die Telegramme fällen, wenn man sich nicht zunächst die Situation vergegenwärtigt, mit der sich die Verfasser auseinanderzusetzen hatten.

Das Jahr 1943 war in sämtlichen europäischen Hauptstädten durch eine intensive diplomatische Aktivität gekennzeichnet, die durch die militärischen Ereignisse ausgelöst worden war: durch den deutsch-italienischen Zusammenbruch in Nordafrika, der im August 1942 begonnen hatte und sich von Niederlage zu Niederlage bis zur Befreiung Italiens durch die Alliierten fortsetzte, durch

²⁴⁹ Ebd.

²⁵⁰ Telegramm Schleiers an Berlin vom 31. Juli 1943, zitiert bei Friedländer, *Pius XII.*, S. 131

²⁵¹ Nach dem Telegramm stammt diese Information von Herrn von Krug, der sie, wie er sagte, von Präsident Laval bekam. Laval erhielt sie von einem seiner Mitarbeiter und dieser wiederum von dem Nuntius in Vichy Msgr. Valerio Valeri. Die Weiterleitung der Information besorgte eine fünfte Person namens Schleier: Der Metzger sagt es der Bäckerfrau, diese sagt es dem Apotheker ...

Die zweite Information wird in folgender Form mitgeteilt: „Wie Gesandter von Krug ergänzend ... erfuhr ...“, das heißt ohne Quellenangabe. Und zu guter Letzt gibt Friedländer dieses Telegramm mit größter Ernst-

die Landung der Amerikaner in Casablanca (8. November 1942) und durch den Fall von Stalingrad (2. Februar 1943), den Beginn des deutschen Zusammenbruchs an der Ostfront. Als erster scheint sich Reichsaußenminister von Ribbentrop der Wende in der militärischen Lage bewußt geworden zu sein. Im November 1942, nach der Landung der Amerikaner in Nordafrika, legte er dem Führer nahe, über die sowjetische Gesandtin in Stockholm, Madame Kolontai, mit Stalin Verbindung aufzunehmen. Die abschlägige Antwort, die er daraufhin einstecken mußte, hinderte ihn, wie er sagte, nicht, im Februar 1943, nach dem Fall Stalingrads, einen erneuten Vorstoß zu unternehmen, bei dem er jedoch trotz der von Roosevelt inspirierten Erklärung von Casablanca, in der dieser die bedingungslose Kapitulation der Achsenmächte forderte, ebenso wenig Erfolg hatte. Ribbentrop fügte hinzu, daß er sich dieses Mal über alles hinweggesetzt und Peter Kleist mit dieser Mission beauftragt habe²⁵², in der Überzeugung, die Russen, die es einem Machiavellismus der Anglo-Amerikaner zuschrieben, daß noch keine zweite Front im Westen eröffnet worden war, und die daher nicht mehr an die Errichtung einer solchen glaubten, zu einem Vergleich veranlassen zu können. Peter Kleist bestätigt dies²⁵³.

Wie es scheint, erfolgte die erste Reaktion Mussolinis anlässlich des Besuches von Reichsmarschall Göring in Rom am 4. Dezember

haftigkeit wieder, so als hätte er gar nicht bemerkt, daß die beiden Informationen nicht übereinstimmen: denn schließlich, ist „in den Kreisen des Vatikans eine stärkere Neigung erkennbar“? Oder ist es der Papst selbst, der „mit allen Mitteln bestrebt“ ist? Es ist klar, daß, wenn es sich um den Papst handelt, es sich nicht mehr nur um „eine stärkere Neigung“, sondern um die *überwiegende* Tendenz handelt. Der erste Satz sagt jedoch ganz klar, daß sie *nicht überwiegt*. Aus diesem Grunde widersprechen sich die beiden Sätze. Wenn überhaupt irgendjemand „mit allen Mitteln bestrebt“ ist, etwas zu tun, dann ist es im vorliegenden Fall der Verfasser dieses Telegramms, der bestrebt ist, den Empfänger davon zu überzeugen, daß Pius XII. für eine Umkehrung der Bündnisse sei: und zwar indem er das auf Grund einer Information aus fünfter Hand beweist, die überdies sehr weit davon entfernt ist, diese Behauptung zu stützen, nämlich durch eine Reihe von Informationen, die um so unerschütterlicher als sicher hingestellt werden, als sie nur ungesicherte Referenzen („Der Nuntius habe . . . erwidert“) oder sogar überhaupt keine haben. Eine letzte Bemerkung: dieser Schleier mußte besonders qualifiziert sein, um die Telegramme der deutschen Botschaft in Paris zu verfassen: er kennt nicht einmal den genauen Namen des Informanten, den er nennt, der nicht „von Krug“ ist, sondern „Krug von Nidda“!

²⁵² Nach *Nazi Conspiracy and Aggression*, amerikanische Ausgabe, Ergänzungsband B, S. 1203 f.

²⁵³ Peter Kleist, *Zwischen Hitler und Stalin 1939–1945*

1942. Wie Graf Ciano berichtet, habe ihm der Duce eine kurze Zusammenfassung der unter vier Augen geführten Unterredung der beiden Männer diktiert: „Der Duce glaubt, daß auf eine oder die andere Weise das Kapitel des Krieges gegen Rußland, der keinen Zweck mehr hat, abgeschlossen werden muß. Falls es möglich scheint, zu einem zweiten Brest-Litowsk zu gelangen (das man haben könnte, indem man Rußland territoriale Entschädigungen in Mittelasien gibt), muß dafür gesorgt werden, eine Defensivlinie zu errichten, die jede feindliche Initiative zerschlägt, und zwar bei geringstem Einsatz der Achsenkräfte. Göring sagt, dies wäre Hitlers Ideal²⁵⁴.“

In Italien mischte sich die öffentliche Meinung ein, vor allem nach dem Fall von Stalingrad: So kam es im März in Turin und Mailand zu bedeutenden Streiks. Schließlich löste die militärische Lage im Großrat des Faschismus jene Meinungsverschiedenheiten aus, die zum Sturz Mussolinis führten. Die Rolle, die der italienische König, der nur gezwungenermaßen den Faschismus akzeptiert und dem Krieg zugestimmt hatte, in dieser Angelegenheit spielte, ist zu bekannt und zu wenig umstritten, als daß wir dabei verweilen wollen. Das gleiche gilt für die von Graf Ciano. Über Krieg und Frieden gab es in Italiens öffentlicher Meinung wenigstens vier verschiedene Strömungen: diejenigen, die 1943 für einen Sonderfrieden mit dem Osten eintraten; die Befürworter eines Sonderfriedens mit dem Westen, aber eines Friedens, an dem die Achsenmächte, nicht nur Italien allein, beteiligt sein würden; die Befürworter eines Separatfriedens Italiens mit dem Westen; und die Radikalen, die für ein Verbleiben an der Seite Deutschlands plädierten. Eine reiche italienische Memoirenliteratur legt davon Zeugnis ab, daß alle diese Strömungen angesehene Vertreter in den politisch führenden Kreisen hatten: Das Buch jener schlichten und würdigen Frau, Rachele Mussolini²⁵⁵, der Ehefrau des Duce, gehört zu diesem Schrifttum.

²⁵⁴ *Journal du Comte Ciano*, Neufchatel, S. 532, unter dem Datum vom 6. Dezember 1942. (Zitiert nach Deakin, *Die brutale Freundschaft*, S. 111 f. — Anm. d. Übers.) Man beachte, daß Göring mit Ribbentrop übereinstimmt und nicht mit Hitler.

²⁵⁵ Rachele Mussolini, *Ma Vie avec le Duce*

Die bedeutendste dieser Strömungen war die der Anhänger eines Separatfriedens zwischen der Achse und dem Westen. Ihre Führer brachten es fertig, Ungarn, Rumänien und die Türkei in ihr Fahrwasser zu ziehen und Spanien und Portugal positiv für dieses Ziel zu interessieren; ferner bemühten sie sich um die Unterstützung des Vatikans. Die Verfechter der Trennung Italiens von Deutschland, die nur eine kleine Gruppe darstellten, weil Deutschland praktisch bei der geringsten Willensregung dieser Art ganz Italien besetzt hätte, was Italien auf alle Fälle zu einer Weiterführung des Krieges bewog, taten das gleiche. In dieser Form übrigens rollte nach dem Sturz Mussolinis das Unternehmen Badoglio ab. Sämtliche Reden Mussolinis, sämtliche Berichte über seine Unterredungen mit Hitler beweisen, daß er für einen Sonderfrieden der Achsenmächte mit dem Osten eintrat und daß er wiederholt bei Hitler in diesem Sinne vorstellig wurde. Aus diesem Grunde dürfte die Äußerung Deakins, der Duce habe der Initiative Bastianinis für einen Sonderfrieden Italiens mit dem Westen seine Zustimmung gegeben, nur wenig oder gar nicht den Tatsachen entsprechen. Auch Msgr. Maglione dürfte sich kaum dieser Initiative angeschlossen und in Kenntnis der Sachlage dem Bankier Fummi einen vatikanischen Paß bewilligt haben. Bastianini berichtet es zwar²⁵⁶, doch nach dem Kriege mußte er sich schließlich in Italien aus der Affäre ziehen, und da der Duce wie auch Msgr. Maglione tot waren, konnten sie ihm nicht widersprechen. Andererseits gestattet keine einzige der durch unbestreitbare Dokumente bezeugten Reden, Schriften oder Handlungen des Papstes oder Msgr. Magliones die Annahme, daß sie einer Aktion für einen Sonderfrieden zwischen den Westmächten und Italien allein ihre Zustimmung gegeben hätten. Sämtliche Äußerungen beweisen, daß sie nicht einmal für einen von den Achsenmächten in diesem Sinne ausgehandelten Frieden mit dem Westen, sondern für einen allgemeinen Frieden waren. Und das Telegramm des deutschen Botschafters in Madrid? Es ist möglich, daß sich der Bankier Fummi zum angegebenen Zeitpunkt in Lissabon befand — es ist sogar kaum zu bestreiten. Doch Fummi war Vermögensverwalter des Vatikans, und in dieser Eigenschaft reiste er viel mit einem Paß des Vatikans und

²⁵⁶ Giuseppe Bastianini, *Uomini, cose, fatti*

der Zustimmung der italienischen Regierung, was genügt, seine Unterredung mit dem Duce vor seiner Abreise aus Rom zu erklären. Der deutsche Botschafter in Lissabon schließlich hat Fummis Anwesenheit in jener Hauptstadt zweifellos deswegen nicht gemeldet, weil er den Zweck dieser Anwesenheit kannte. Wenn nun dieser Zweck der von Bastianini angegebene gewesen wäre, so besteht kein Zweifel daran, daß der Führer in dem Augenblick, in dem er das Telegramm des deutschen Botschafters aus Madrid erhalten und von diesem Verrat seines italienischen Partners erfahren hätte, ihm gegenüber in einen Zorn geraten wäre, dessen Echo noch heute zu hören sein würde. Aber das trat keinesfalls ein. Im Gegenteil, man weiß, was er tat, um den von Badoglio gefangen genommenen Mussolini zu retten. Das beweist, daß er sowohl über den Zweck der Reisen des Bankiers Fummi wie auch darüber orientiert war, welchen Glauben er dem Telegramm seines Botschafters in Madrid beizumessen hatte.

Diese nach Westen gerichtete diplomatische Aktivität, die sich von der Hoffnung nährte, den Vatikan daran zu beteiligen, gewinnt eine ganz besondere Bedeutung, wenn man weiß, daß sie noch durch eine andere erhöht wurde, die von der deutschen Opposition gegen das Naziregime ausging. Diese Opposition war bestrebt, von Pius XII. die Unterstützung der deutschen Katholiken für jene Bewegung zu erlangen, die sie in Deutschland gegen Hitler zu organisieren versuchte, und sie hatte gerade erreicht, daß einer ihrer Anhänger, von Weizsäcker — nach ihrer Aussage wie auch nach der Weizsäckers —, im Juli 1943 zum Botschafter in Rom ernannt wurde. Infolgedessen erhalten auch die Telegramme Weizsäckers einen ganz besonderen Sinn. Aus dem, was er über seine Rolle sagte, und aus dem, was die bisher veröffentlichten Dokumente bezeugen, geht hervor, daß er weit mehr von der Hoffnung getragen war, Pius XII. möge zugunsten der Verhandlungen für einen Sonderfrieden zwischen den Achsen- und den Westmächten Stellung nehmen, als von jener, den Papst zu bewegen, bei den deutschen Katholiken die Opposition gegen Hitler zu unterstützen. Diese Hoffnung, die er als auf Realitäten gegründet hinstellt, die in Wirklichkeit aber nichts anderes sind als reine Konstruktionen eines im Grunde völlig anders ausgerichteten Gei-

stes spiegelt sich in seinen Telegrammen. Er wußte überdies, daß er durch den Versuch, Ribbentrop und Hitler dahin zu bringen, diese Gedankengebäude ernst zu nehmen, einerseits seine Rolle zur Geltung brachte und andererseits absolut nichts aufs Spiel setzte.

Denn welche Vorstellungen hegten Ribbentrop und Hitler im Jahre 1943 von den diplomatischen Möglichkeiten? Wie wir wissen, hatte Ribbentrop, obwohl Hitler gegen einen solchen Plan war, nach dem Fall Stalingrads einen seiner Abteilungsleiter, Peter Kleist, beauftragt, mit dem Osten Kontakt aufzunehmen, da dieser dort über die meisten und verschiedenartigsten Beziehungen verfügte. Durch Peter Kleist ist überdies bekannt, daß bis Oktober 1943²⁵⁷, sofern nur sein Chef die Zustimmung Hitlers erhalten hätte, Aussichten für einen Separatfrieden der Achsenmächte mit dem Osten bestanden²⁵⁸. Daß Hitler nichts von einem solchen Vorhaben hielt, ist leicht begreiflich. Denn schließlich war die nationalsozialistische Bewegung aus dem Gegensatz zum Bolschewismus entstanden, und nur der bis zum äußersten gehende Wirklichkeitssinn der Deutschen hatte es Hitler ermöglicht, sie ohne irgendwelche Schwierigkeiten dahin zu bringen, den deutsch-sowjetischen Pakt vom 23. August 1939 zu akzeptieren.

Konnte Hitler es sich erlauben, das Unternehmen vom 23. August 1939 zu wiederholen? Er glaubte es nicht, und alles, was bis jetzt über ihn bekannt ist, beweist seine Überzeugung, daß ein solches Unternehmen angesichts der durch den Fall von Stalingrad geschaffenen militärischen Situation den sicheren Triumph des Bolschewismus in Europa bedeutet hätte. Vor Stalingrad und bis zu Stalingrad stand diese Frage nicht zur Debatte: Er war sicher, Rußland zu vernichten und dadurch die Westmächte zu einem Vergleich zu veranlassen. Sein Irrtum nach Stalingrad bestand darin, zu glauben, daß er, wie General de Gaulle am 18. Juni 1940 von Frankreich sagte, nur eine Schlacht verloren habe und daß es ihm gelingen würde, die Situation zu bereinigen, und er die Westmächte zwingen würde, ihre Forderung nach einer bedingungslosen Kapitulation zurückzunehmen. Daher die diplomatischen Offensiven,

²⁵⁷ Datum der Konferenz der Alliierten in Moskau

²⁵⁸ Kleist, *Zwischen Hitler und Stalin*

für die er Ribbentrop im Westen vollen Spielraum ließ, ohne jedoch zu hoffen, daß sie Erfolg haben könnten, solange er die Situation an der Ostfront nicht zu seinen Gunsten wiederhergestellt haben würde, und deren Drehscheibe nur der Vatikan sein konnte: Sie hatten zumindest den Vorteil, das Terrain vorzubereiten für den Tag, an dem der Sieg seiner Waffen an der Ostfront die Westmächte zum Verhandeln zwingen würde.

Doch die Einstellung des Vatikans zu all dem?

Was den Frieden angeht, läßt sich von Pius XII. nicht ein einziger Text anführen, der seine Bereitschaft erkennen ließe, als Vermittler für einen Frieden aufzutreten, der nicht ein allgemeiner Frieden wäre. Dies schließt seinerseits jede Absicht aus, für eine Wiederherstellung des Friedens im Westen zu intervenieren, durch die einem der Kriegführenden die Möglichkeit gegeben würde, den Krieg im Osten fortzusetzen, oder sich für eine schlichte und einfache Umkehrung der Bündnisse einzusetzen, geschweige denn für einen Sonderfrieden Italiens mit den Westmächten, der bei der militärischen Situation des Jahres 1943 an dem Tatbestand nichts ändern, daher die Sache des Friedens in keiner Weise fördern und nur unmotiviert sein konnte. Die von Friedländer angeführten Telegramme erwähnen nur Gedanken oder Absichten, die Pius XII. willkürlich unterstellt wurden, und Friedländer hütet sich jedesmal, wenn er eines davon zitiert, es mit den wirklichen Gedanken und Absichten Pius' XII. zu vergleichen, so wie dieser sie selbst hundertmal ausgedrückt und wiederholt hat, übrigens oft am gleichen oder nahezu gleichen Tage wie das Telegramm, das das Gegenteil aussagt.

Nach all dem kann sich nur eine einzige Frage erheben: Wem soll man glauben? Dem Papst oder einer so um seine Karriere besorgten Persönlichkeit wie von Bergen²⁵⁹ einer so zwielichtigen Gestalt wie von Weizsäcker²⁶⁰ oder einem so obskuren — und so dummen²⁶¹ — Menschen wie jenem Herrn Schleier? Wenn dies wirklich die einzige Frage ist, die sich erhebt, so ist es leider auch, wie man gemeinhin sagt, eine Frage, „die man nicht stellt“.

²⁵⁹ Vgl. oben S. 70 ff.

²⁶⁰ Vgl. oben S. 159

²⁶¹ Vgl. oben Anm. 251.

Im übrigen fühlt Friedländer wohl von selbst, wie schwach, wenn nicht lächerlich seine Argumentation ist. Er stellt gewisse Dokumente als „bedeutsam“ für die auf der Furcht vor dem Bolschewismus beruhenden pronazistischen Gefühle Pius' XII. hin oder zeigt, wie der Papst um den Frieden im Westen besorgt war, um Hitler die Möglichkeit zu geben, den Bolschewismus zu vernichten, und daß er die sogenannten Kriegsverbrechen des Nationalsozialismus, und zwar nur die, von denen die Juden betroffen waren, nicht deutlicher verurteilt habe, weil er Hitler in jenem Kampf nicht schwächen wollte. Jedesmal, wenn er ein derartiges Dokument zitiert, gibt Friedländer dem Bericht historische Beglaubigung durch Formeln, die der Leser bereits kennt²⁶², wie: „es ist möglich, daß . . . , es ist plausibel . . . , es scheint, daß . . . , das ist nur eine Hypothese, aber . . . “. Einflüsterungsformeln par excellence. Er versteigt sich sogar zu einer Bemerkung wie: „Wir machen darauf aufmerksam, daß wir kein Dokument aus dem Jahre 1940 besitzen, das auf eine solche Absicht hinweist, und daß es sich lediglich um eine Hypothese unsererseits handelt“²⁶³, die um so mehr auf schlichter und einfacher Verleumdung beruht, als Friedländer auch für die Zeit nach 1940 kein Dokument beibringt.

Dies nennt sein Manager, Alfred Grosser, eine „Interpretation der Texte . . . klug, gediegen und scharfsinnig [sic] . . . — manchmal so sehr, daß sie durch Schlußfolgerungen eine dunkle oder bisher falsch gedeutete Formel aufhellt“²⁶⁴. Was die Schlußfolgerung erlaubt: „Die Dokumente, die Friedländer vorlegt, machen es beinahe zur Gewißheit [sic], daß man im Vatikan mit dem Gedanken eines Umsturzes der Allianzen oder mindestens eines separaten Friedens mit dem Westen gespielt hat“²⁶⁵.

Nein! Man verurteilt keinen Menschen auf Grund von Vorgängen, die nur „möglich“ oder „plausibel“ sind, die nur wahr „scheinen“, die nur *lediglich eine Hypothese* oder nur *beinahe gewiß* sind. Im Rechtswesen jedenfalls gibt es kein Gericht — abgesehen natürlich von den Sondergerichten, wir sind ja leider noch nicht aus der

²⁶² Vgl. oben S. 75

²⁶³ Friedländer, *Pius XII.*, S. 53

²⁶⁴ Ebd., S. 165, Nachwort von Alfred Grosser

²⁶⁵ Ebd., S. 166

Zeit der Sondergerichte heraus! —, das einen Menschen, wer es auch immer sein mag, auf in dieser Form vorgebrachte Anklagen hin verurteilen würde, selbst wenn die Verteidigung ihnen nichts Präzises entgegensetzen könnte. Und im vorliegenden Fall fände sich um so weniger eines, als man nicht sagen kann, daß es „Vermutungen“ sind, da man, wie der Leser soeben gesehen hat, ihnen eine große Anzahl authentischer und unumstößlicher Texte und Fakten entgegenhalten kann, die beweisen, daß Pius XII., nachdem er vergeblich alles versucht hatte, was in seiner Macht stand, nicht nur niemals einen Separatfrieden — sei es Italiens allein, sei es der Achse mit den Westmächten — herbeizuführen hoffte oder suchte, sondern im Gegenteil unaufhörlich und systematisch auf einen allgemeinen, gerechten, ehrenvollen und dauerhaften Frieden hinarbeiten bemüht war, der sämtliche Kriegführenden, ohne Ausnahme, eingeschlossen hätte.

Alle seine Äußerungen und alle seine Handlungen vor dem Kriege und während des ganzen Krieges waren von dieser Hoffnung oder diesem Grundsatz diktiert und nicht von jenen gemeinen und niedrigen Empfindungen, die man ihm durch unehrenhafte stilistische Kunstgriffe unterstellte und die nicht auf erwiesene Tatsachen gegründet sind, sondern einzig und allein auf das, was Roger Peyrefitte „Botschaftsklatsch“ nennt²⁶⁶.

Denn er hat gesprochen und gehandelt. Wenig gehandelt, das ist wahr, weil nämlich die Umstände ihm niemals mehr zu tun erlaubten. Doch er hat viel gesagt, ungeheuer viel gesprochen, und zwar stets für den Frieden. Wenn es dagegen um den Krieg ging, schwieg er, doch nur dann, und zwar beharrlich. Damit erhält der Ausdruck „das Schweigen Pius' XII.“ seine ganze und einzig mögliche Bedeutung — jener Ausdruck, den alle oder nahezu alle Zeitungen der Welt Monate um Monate hindurch ihren Lesern bereitwilligst, und zwar meistens auf der Titelseite und mit großen Überschriften, präsentierten: Eine Anklage, von der sie wußten, daß sie grundlos war, und der sie nur zu einem Siege verhelfen konnten durch eine von vornherein gesicherte Propagandakampagne, die sich gegen einen Mann des Friedens richtete und von

²⁶⁶ Roger Peyrefitte, *Les Ambassades* und *La Fin des Ambassades*

Männern betrieben wurde, deren besonderes Kennzeichen darin besteht, daß sie als krankhafte Deutschenhasser, Freunde der Sowjets und fanatische Kriegstreiber den Krieg zunächst mit voller Absicht gewollt haben und ihn dann mit Versessenheit bis zum Ende hin wollten, trotz all der höchst annehmbaren Friedenschancen, die sich ihnen boten. Männer, die überdies hinterher durch die etwa 50 Millionen Toten und die Milliarden und aber Milliarden von Zerstörungen, die sie auf dem Gewissen haben, nicht sehr in Verlegenheit gebracht zu sein scheinen. Mit einem Wort: Männer, die bereit sind, wieder von neuem damit anzufangen. Gerechterweise muß man zugeben, daß Rolf Hochhuth und Saul Friedländer zu jung sind, als daß diese Anklage sie persönlich betreffen könnte: Sie gehören zum Clan, und sie schlagen sich für den Clan. Was man von ihren Managern und ihren Anhängern zu halten hat, möge der Leser dem voraufgehenden Kapitel entnehmen.

Der Vollständigkeit halber bleiben jetzt noch die politischen Hintergründe des Unternehmens „*Stellvertreter*“ zu analysieren.

Kapitel III

Die politischen Hintergründe des Unternehmens

I. DER VERSAILLER VERTRAG ALS URSACHE

Der Stellvertreter ist nichts weiter als ein politisches Unternehmen. Um sich davon zu überzeugen, genügt es, die Behauptungen Rolf Hochhuths, seiner Manager und seiner Anhänger in ihren historischen Zusammenhang einzuordnen. Dazu müssen wir kurz zurückblenden, zumindest bis zur Machtergreifung Hitlers in Deutschland und auf die Rolle, die das religiöse Moment dabei spielte.

Der Versailler Vertrag hatte mit seinen wirtschaftlichen und finanziellen Klauseln Deutschland eine eiserne Zwangsjacke angelegt. Nachdem der Vertrag die deutsche Wirtschaft zerschlagen und unfähig gemacht hatte, auch nur das Geringste zu produzieren, was für den Export geeignet gewesen wäre, nahm er Deutschland außerdem für den Tag, an dem es wieder erstarkt sein würde, seine Kunden im Ausland (die Kolonien und die Donaustaaten) und unterwarf alle etwaigen Handelsverträge mit anderen Staaten drakonischen Bedingungen. So erlebte Deutschland, dessen Staatsgebiet um 102 000 Quadratkilometer beschnitten worden war, im Jahre 1923 einen ersten Bankrott, den die Weltkrise von 1929 (Bankkrach der Wallstreet), gegen die es gerade wegen des Versailler Vertrages empfindlicher sein mußte als irgendein anderer Staat, im Jahre 1932 endgültig zu machen drohte.

Dieses Jahr 1932 war für Deutschland ein entsetzliches Jahr: Am 31. Juli zeigte die offizielle Statistik dort 5 392 248 Arbeitslose an, was 12 bis 15% seiner erwerbstätigen Bevölkerung entsprach, während, wie es gegenwärtig das Beispiel der Vereinigten Staaten zu Beginn eines jeden Winters erneut zeigt, 5% das Maximum dessen darstellen, was bei den herkömmlichen Strukturen der Weltwirtschaft erträglich ist. Zu Beginn des Winters 1932/1933 war die 6-Millionen-Grenze überschritten und ein Ende dieser Entwicklung nicht abzusehen. Es braucht, glaube ich, nicht hervorgehoben zu werden, welche politische Unsicherheit aus dieser wirtschaftlichen Instabilität resultierte: Vom Ende des Frühjahres 1932 an gab es keine parlamentarische Mehrheit mehr, und die beiden Neuwahlen, die man nach zweimaliger Auflösung des Reichstages innerhalb von drei Monaten in der Hoffnung vornahm, eine sol-

che zu finden, erwiesen sich nicht nur als vergeblich, sondern verschlimmerten die politische Lage nur noch.

Es wird heutzutage für gewöhnlich die Meinung vertreten — und unter Verleugnung ihrer Vorgänger von 1919 stehen die Sozialisten und Kommunisten an der Spitze derer, die dies behaupten —, daß Deutschland sich sehr wohl und sehr leicht mit den wirtschaftlichen und finanziellen Bestimmungen des Versailler Vertrages abfinden konnte, daß es aber systematisch nicht gewollt habe und einzig und allein um zu beweisen, daß es das nicht konnte, absichtlich selbst diese Situation geschaffen habe. Der Verfasser dieser Studie hat schon zu häufig und immer wieder dargelegt, daß es sich, welchen Ruf und welches Ansehen die Verfechter dieser These auch genießen mögen, nur um ungereimtes Zeug handelt. Er wird sich daher darauf beschränken, die Sozialisten und Kommunisten von heute auf ihre Vorfahren von 1919 zu verweisen, deren Urteil über diesen Punkt untadelig war und es auch geblieben ist.

Fest steht, daß der alte Feldmarschall Hindenburg am 30. Januar 1933 Hitler zum Nachfolger des Reichskanzlers von Schleicher ernannte. Zwei Tage vorher hatte von Schleicher — dem von Papen und diesem wiederum Brüning vorhergegangen war, alles dies in acht Monaten und bei zwei Parlamentswahlen! — in einer Atmosphäre sozialer Unruhen, die auf ihrem Höhepunkt angekommen war und zu der die NSDAP den Schlüssel besaß, seinen Rücktritt erklärt, nachdem er auch seinerseits im Reichstag ohne Regierungsmehrheit geblieben war.

Nicht, daß Hindenburg aus freien Stücken gehandelt hätte: Er hatte bis dahin von Hitler stets nur mit Geringschätzung gesprochen: „Jener böhmische Gefreite“, sagte er. Doch die Umstände geboten es. Wenn man sagt, es habe keine Regierungsmehrheit gegeben, so handelt es sich dabei wohlverstanden um die Mehrheit der Mittelparteien unter Ausschluß der Nationalsozialisten und Kommunisten: Zusammen waren ihnen die beiden Extreme bei sämtlichen Abstimmungen zahlenmäßig überlegen. Aber rein rechnerisch gab es noch zwei weitere Mehrheiten, die sich jeweils auf einem Flügel aufbauten: eine Mehrheit der politischen Linken, die die Kommunisten, Sozialdemokraten und das katholische Zen-

trum umfaßt hätte, wozu noch die wenigen Überlebenden der demokratischen Deutschen Staats-Partei gekommen wären, und eine Mehrheit der politischen Rechten, die vom katholischen Zentrum bis zu den Nationalsozialisten gereicht hätte. Die Kommunisten, die systematisch und ohne einen Unterschied zu machen gegen alle Regierungen stimmten — ein Verfahren, das, nebenbei gesagt, von 1919 an in fortschreitendem Maße sämtliche parlamentarischen Mehrheiten nach rechts gedrängt hatte —, machten die erste Mehrheit unmöglich. Das war der Grund, der das katholische Zentrum an dem Tage, an dem es die Überzeugung gewann, daß keinerlei Möglichkeit bestand, die Unterstützung der Kommunisten gegen Hitler im Parlament zu erlangen, bewog, ein Arrangement mit diesem zu suchen. Der Urheber dieses Übereinkommens war der Zentrumsführer Msgr. Kaas. Der gesamte deutsche Episkopat stand diesem Schritt feindlich gegenüber. Doch nach den Wahlen vom 6. November 1932 hielt Msgr. Kaas in Anbetracht ihrer Ergebnisse, die nichts oder so gut wie nichts am Kräfteverhältnis unter den Fraktionen geändert hatten, eine Rede, deren Thema im wesentlichen darin bestand, daß den sozialen Unruhen ein Ende gesetzt werden müsse, daß es nur einen Weg dazu gäbe, nämlich den, daß Deutschland regiert werden müsse, und daß man dadurch, daß man alle drei oder vier Monate an die Wählerschaft heranträte, nur die Agitation im Land in Gang hielte, ohne dabei an der parlamentarischen Situation irgend etwas zu ändern, und daß, da es keinerlei Möglichkeiten gäbe, mit den Kommunisten zu einem Kompromiß zu gelangen, nur noch ein Weg übrigbliebe, nämlich der Versuch, mit Hitler zu einem Vergleich zu kommen. Und er setzte sich dafür ein. Hitler, der der Überzeugung war, daß ihn, einmal Reichskanzler geworden, nichts würde hindern können, auf verfassungsmäßigem Wege unumschränkte Vollmachten zu erlangen, zeigte sich unter der Bedingung, daß ihm der Kanzlerposten zuteil würde, zu einem solchen Kompromiß bereit.

Die Regierung, die der neue Kanzler am 30. Januar 1933 bildete, umfaßte außer ihm selbst nur zwei Nationalsozialisten: den Innenminister Frick und den Staatsminister Göring. Die anderen acht Posten verteilten sich auf Mitglieder der Deutschnationalen Volkspartei und anderer kleiner Gruppen der politischen Rechten; Vize-

kanzler war von Papen. Diese Zusammensetzung schien zu beweisen, daß Hitler gewillt war, verfassungsmäßig zu regieren.

Die wahre nationalsozialistische Regierung wurde erst im Anschluß an Wahlen gebildet, die am 5. März 1933 stattfanden, denn bereits beim ersten Zusammentritt des am 30. Januar gebildeten Kabinetts setzte Hitler den Beschluß zu einer erneuten Auflösung des Reichstages durch, was seinen ersten Regierungsakt darstellte.

Diese Wahlen vom 5. März 1933 nahmen eine besondere Wendung und sind es wert, daß man einen Augenblick bei ihnen verweilt. Zunächst einmal fanden sie unter der Kontrolle der an der Macht befindlichen NSDAP statt — ein gewichtiges Argument. Weiter war Msgr. Kaas, der Führer des katholischen Zentrums, immer noch davon überzeugt, daß Hitler verfassungsmäßig regieren würde; schließlich hatte dieser es ihm ja persönlich versprochen. In einer großen Wahlrede, die er am 2. März in Köln unter dem Vorsitz des späteren Bundeskanzlers und damaligen Bürgermeisters von Köln, Adenauer, der dieser Meinung beipflichtete, hielt, legte Msgr. Kaas seinen Standpunkt im einzelnen dar, wobei er klar herausstellte, daß es für die Rettung Deutschlands nur noch eine Lösung gäbe, da die Kommunisten ... usw. usw. Und schließlich bildete Vizekanzler von Papen mit Hitler gegenüber der Wählerschaft eine Mannschaft. Ergebnis: Hitler erhielt 17 265 800 Stimmen gleich 43,7% und 288 Mandate, von Papen 52 Mandate mit 8% der Stimmen. Der neue Reichstag umfaßte 648 Abgeordnete: Die Rechtsparteien verfügten also über eine überwältigende Mehrheit. Von da an hatte Hitler freie Bahn: Die unumschränkten Vollmachten wurden ihm rasch in den verfassungsmäßigen Formen gewährt, und die Art und Weise, in der er davon Gebrauch machte, sammelte das deutsche Volk, das zu wiederholten Malen seine Beschlüsse durch Volksabstimmung mit Mehrheiten, die jedesmal an Einstimmigkeit heranreichten, begeistert billigte.

Man hat gesagt, daß die ganze Kunst Hitlers darin bestanden habe, das deutsche Volk davon zu überzeugen, daß die Ursache aller seiner Leiden der Versailler Vertrag sei. Doch in diesem Punkt sprachen sämtliche deutschen Parteien, von der äußersten Linken bis zur äußersten Rechten, die gleiche Sprache. Warum also gerade Hitler und nicht die Sozialdemokraten, das katholische Zentrum

oder die Kommunisten? Die Antwort ist einfach: Hitler war geschickt genug, das deutsche Volk zu der Einsicht zu bringen, daß die feindliche Einstellung der Sozialdemokraten und des Zentrums gegenüber dem Versailler Vertrag überwiegend Fassade war. Die ersteren nämlich hatten ihn unterzeichnet, und beide zusammen hatten, obwohl sie seit gut zwölf Jahren an der Regierung teilnahmen, offenbar nicht sehr viele Anstrengungen gemacht, um die nach Artikel 19 der Völkerbundsakte vorgesehene Revision des Vertrages durchzusetzen. Er fügte hinzu, diese feindliche Einstellung sei deshalb nur Fassade, weil die beiden Parteien völlig den Juden ergeben seien, die er mit dem internationalen Großkapitalismus gleichsetzte und die, wie er anklagend sagte, die einzigen seien, die aus diesem Vertrag Vorteil zögen. Die Kommunisten hingegen seien nur die Agenten eines ebenfalls von den Juden inspirierten Unternehmens — war nicht Marx ein Jude? —, das nur darauf abziele, ihnen einen noch umfassenderen Einfluß auf Deutschland zu sichern, und zwar durch eine soziale Agitation, deren Zweck nur darin bestünde, sein wirtschaftliches und politisches Leben zu zerrütten, um das Land in ihre Abhängigkeit zu bringen. Deutschland ein Opfer der Juden und Marxisten, deren Hauptstadt Moskau sei. Es war nur ein Kinderspiel für ihn, aus dem durch Stalin repräsentierten Bolschewismus ein wahres Schreckgespenst mit Klauen zu machen, dem Deutschland, falls es ihm nicht gelingen würde, sämtliche Hypotheken, die durch den Versailler Vertrag auf ihm lasteten, zu beseitigen, unrettbar verfallen wäre.

Alles dies wurde in einem zugleich sicheren und entschiedenen Ton, einer klaren, mit packenden Formulierungen durchwirkten Sprache vorgetragen, die, wie selbst ein Mann wie William L. Shirer zugibt²⁶⁷, „oft die Gipfel der Beredsamkeit erreichte“. Es überzeugte und ließ Hitler in den Augen des deutschen Volkes als den einzigen Mann erscheinen, der es aus der Sackgasse, in der es durch den Versailler Vertrag festgehalten wurde, herausführen konnte. Auf alle Fälle hatten die anderen es schließlich in zwölf Jahren nicht daraus befreit. Und was ist zum Kern der Sache zu sagen? Es ist ganz offensichtlich, daß der Nationalsozialismus wie alle Dok-

²⁶⁷ William L. Shirer, *Le III^e Reich, des origines à la chute*

trinen, die im Feuer der Aktion geschmiedet werden — auch der Bolschewismus macht davon keine Ausnahme —, eine inhumane Lehre war. Dennoch wird man eines Tages sehr wohl zugeben müssen — man kommt zwar nur ganz langsam dahin, doch man kommt dahin —, daß er, zumindest in einem Punkt, unbestreitbar recht hatte: Es ist in der Tat sehr wahr, daß der Versailler Vertrag die Ursache aller übel war, unter denen das deutsche Volk litt und von denen die anderen Völker verschont waren. Da dieser Punkt das zentrale Thema der gesamten politischen Propaganda Hitlers darstellte, machte er seine ganze Stärke aus, und zwar in einem solchen Maße und so durchgreifend, daß der Stimmenanteil der NSDAP von 1924 (Reichstagswahlen vom 7. Dezember) bis 1932 (Reichstagswahlen vom 6. November) von 3% auf 33,1% stieg. (Bei den Reichstagswahlen vom 31. Juli 1932 hatte sie sogar 37,3% erzielt.)

Die internationale Finanzwelt, keineswegs nur die deutsche, entschied sich, insbesondere von 1928 an, dafür — auf welche Weise, habe ich an anderer Stelle dargelegt²⁶⁸ —, Hitler unter Bevorzugung gegenüber allen deutschen Parteien, die eine Revision des Versailler Vertrages durch gemäßigte Mittel und Wege forderten, auf dem Gebiet der Propaganda zu subventionieren und seine wirtschaftlichen und politischen Argumente durch ihre klingenden und vollwichtigen Argumente zu unterstützen.

Ich werde nicht wieder darauf zurückkommen: Vielmehr soll auf diesem Untergrund jetzt gezeigt werden, welche Rolle das religiöse Moment bei der Machtergreifung Hitlers spielte.

²⁶⁸ Rassiniér, *Zum Fall Eichmann: Was ist Wahrheit? Oder die unbelehrbaren Sieger*

II. DIE MOTIVE DER PROTESTANTEN

Nichts kann meines Erachtens die Rolle, die dieses Moment spielte, besser herausstellen als ein kurzer Überblick über die vier letzten Wahlen, die für die Weimarer Republik die Totenglocke läuteten: die Wahl des Reichspräsidenten am 14. März und 10. April 1932 und die drei Parlamentswahlen, die nach drei Auflösungen des Reichstages am 31. Juli 1932, am 6. November 1932 und am 5. März 1933 stattfanden.

Durch Erfahrung endlich klug geworden, werde ich zunächst einige Texte eines Mannes zitieren, der wie die meisten bekannten Persönlichkeiten unter den Gegnern des Nationalsozialismus niemals *selbst* gegen Hitler kämpfte, sondern sich damit begnügte, zwischen ihm und uns die Punkte zu notieren, und der daher mir gegenüber den Vorzug besitzt, nicht verdächtig zu sein: von William L. Shirer, auf den ich mich bereits zwei- oder dreimal berufen habe. Als amerikanischer Journalist hat William L. Shirer den Nationalsozialismus von seinen Anfängen bis zu seinem Untergang Schritt für Schritt verfolgt. Außerdem ist er Protestant, und in dieser Hinsicht ist seine Ansicht nicht uninteressant — aber nur in dieser Hinsicht, denn im Hinblick auf die Geschichte ... Kurz, hören wir, was er als Zeuge der Ereignisse über die Präsidentenwahl vom 14. März und 10. April 1932 sagt:

„Alle herkömmlichen Partei- und Klassenbindungen gerieten in der ... Hitze des Wahlkampfes durcheinander. Hindenburg, der Protestant, Preuße, Konservative und Monarchist, stützte sich auf die Sozialdemokraten, die Gewerkschaften, die Katholiken des Zentrums (unter Brüning) und die Reste der liberaldemokratischen bürgerlichen Parteien. *Für Hitler*, den Katholiken, Österreicher, früheren Obdachlosen, den ‚Nationalsozialisten‘ und Führer der kleinbürgerlichen Massen, waren außer seinen eigenen Anhängern *die protestantischen (bürgerlichen) Oberschichten des Nordens*²⁶⁹, die konservativen Agrarier (die Junker) und zahlreiche Monarchisten, zu denen sich in letzter Minute der frühere Kronprinz gesellte²⁷⁰.“

²⁶⁹ Von mir kursiv, P. R.

²⁷⁰ Shirer, *Aufstieg*, S. 151 f.

Oder ferner:

„Es war deutlich, daß, *von den Katholiken abgesehen*, die (bürgerlichen) Mittel- und Oberschichten zur NSDAP übergegangen waren²⁷¹.“ Man hat richtig gelesen: „... von den Katholiken abgesehen...“

Oder ferner, dieses Mal jedoch im Hinblick auf die Reichstagswahlen:

„Während dieser Reichstagswahlen [es handelt sich um die drei obengenannten] konnte man nicht umhin zu bemerken, daß die protestantische Geistlichkeit — Niemöller war ein eindrucksvolles Beispiel dafür — sehr freimütig die Nationalisten und sogar die republikfeindlichen Nationalsozialisten unterstützte. Ebenso wie Niemöller begrüßten die meisten Protestanten die Übernahme des Kanzleramtes durch Adolf Hitler im Jahre 1933 mit Befriedigung²⁷².“

Die Sonderberichterstatter sämtlicher Zeitungen der Welt haben damals die gleiche Information, häufig in weitaus genaueren Worten, in sämtlichen Hauptstädten verbreitet. Obwohl sie seitdem oft in Erinnerung gerufen wurde — allerdings in einer Presse, die keinen sehr großen Leserkreis besitzt —, ist sie niemals auch nur im geringsten dementiert worden. Die Betroffenen und ihre Anhänger stellten sich taub: der Mantel, mit dem Noahs Scham bedeckt wurde. Es steht also fest: Die protestantische Geistlichkeit in Deutschland stand bei den Wahlkampagnen Hitlers an seiner Seite.

Und welche Haltung nahm der katholische Klerus ein? Vor jeder dieser vier Wahlen trat in Fulda die Konferenz der katholischen Bischöfe zu einer politischen Stellungnahme zusammen, und jedesmal endete sie mit einer öffentlich bekanntgemachten gemeinsamen Erklärung, die den Nationalsozialismus in heftigen Worten als eine Rückkehr zum Heidentum und seine Mitglieder als „Abtrünnige der Kirche, denen man die Sakramente verweigern muß“, verurteilte, die empfahl, nicht für seine Kandidaten zu stimmen und es „den Katholiken [untersagte], Mitglied seiner Jugend- oder anderen Organisationen zu sein“. Im April 1932 beim zweiten

²⁷¹ Ebd., S. 161

²⁷² Shirer, *Le III^e Reich*, Bd. I, S. 259

Wahlgang der Präsidentenwahl empfahlen die katholischen Bischöfe in Deutschland sogar, für den *Protestanten* Hindenburg zu stimmen, während die protestantische Geistlichkeit, wie man gesehen hat, für Hitler stimmen ließ!

Es soll nicht näher auf die Texte eingegangen werden, die diese Stellungnahme bezeugen. Es genügt, eine Tatsache anzuführen, die sie alle resümiert und die in der nichtkatholischen Presse groß herausgestellt wurde. Sie beweist, daß der katholische Episkopat in den entscheidenden Stunden des März 1933 und selbst noch nach dem Sieg des Nationalsozialismus bei den Reichstagswahlen vom 5. jenes Monats — für die die Konferenz von Fulda vom 22. Februar empfohlen hatte, wie bei den vorhergehenden Wahlen gegen seine Kandidaten zu stimmen — dem Nationalsozialismus immer noch mit heftiger Feindschaft gegenüberstand.

Die Eröffnungssitzung des am 5. März gewählten neuen Reichstages hatte am 21. März in Potsdam stattgefunden. Ihr gingen, dem Ritus gemäß, zwei religiöse Feierlichkeiten voraus, die eine in der Nikolaikirche für die Protestanten, die andere in der Peter-Pauls-Kirche für die Katholiken. In der ersteren wurde der Gottesdienst durch den protestantischen Bischof von Berlin, Dr. Dibelius, abgehalten, der in einer Predigt über das für seine Geisteshaltung sehr bezeichnende Thema „Ist Gott mit uns, wer mag wider uns sein?“ den Sieg Hitlers begrüßte. Der katholische Bischof von Berlin, Msgr. Christian Schreiber, der in der letzteren die Messe lesen sollte, meldete sich krank — eine vorgeschützte Krankheit, wie man in der nationalsozialistischen Presse sagte — und beauftragte um einen Skandal zu vermeiden, einen seiner Vikare mit seiner Vertretung.

Entgegen den Gepflogenheiten, nach denen der Reichskanzler beiden Feierlichkeiten beizuwohnen hatte und nach denen seine Anwesenheit bei der zweiten um so mehr gefordert wurde, als er katholisch war, nahm er nicht daran teil. Am Tag darauf, dem 22. März, motivierte die *Kölnische Volkszeitung*, die diese Tatsache hervorhob, die Abwesenheit Hitlers und seines Propagandaministers (Goebbels) damit, daß „die katholischen Bischöfe von Deutschland ... in einer Reihe von Erklärungen ... Führer und Mitglieder der NSDAP als Abtrünnige der Kirche bezeichnet [haben], die

nicht in den Genuß der Sakramente kommen dürften.“ (Erklärungen der Konferenz von Fulda, auf die weiter oben angespielt wurde.)

Der Propagandaminister fügte hinzu: „Der Kanzler hat während der Zeit des offiziellen Gottesdienstes zusammen mit dem Reichsminister für Volksaufklärung und Propaganda, Dr. Goebbels, auf den dasselbe zutrifft, die Gräber seiner ermordeten SA-Kameraden auf dem Luisenstädtischen Friedhof in Berlin besucht.“

Das zeigt, daß diese Verurteilung des Nationalsozialismus nicht auf den aus eigener Initiative, ohne Berücksichtigung der Meinung des Vatikans (wo Kardinal Pacelli, der spätere Pius XII., Staatssekretär war) handelnden katholischen Episkopat in Deutschland beschränkt war, sondern daß die katholische Kirche überall diesen Standpunkt vertrat. Für Frankreich ist das bekannt. Das gleiche war in Österreich der Fall, wo in allen Kirchen ein Hirtenbrief von Msgr. Johannes Gföllner, dem Bischof von Linz, vom 23. Januar 1933 verlesen wurde, aus dem sämtliche österreichischen Zeitungen und sämtliche katholischen Blätter Deutschlands große Auszüge abdruckten. Der Hirtenbrief selbst soll hier nicht wiedergegeben werden, doch sei die Einführung zitiert, die ihm in der Münchner Zeitung *Schönere Zukunft* vom 7. Februar 1933 vorangestellt wurde:

„Bekanntlich haben sich die katholischen Bischöfe Deutschlands bereits mehrfach gegen den Nationalsozialismus ausgesprochen. Soeben wurde nun von Dr. Gföllner, dem ersten der österreichischen Bischöfe, ein Hirtenbrief veröffentlicht, in dem er den Nationalsozialismus als Feind der Kirche verurteilt. Und da sich die Nationalsozialisten im katholischen Österreich, sei es in ihren Versammlungen, sei es in ihrer Presse, als echte Katholiken ausgegeben haben, leistet die Stellungnahme des Bischofs von Linz durch die Aufdeckung ihres Doppelspiels einen Dienst von äußerster Wichtigkeit. Dieser Grund veranlaßte uns, den Text seines Hirtenbriefes nachstehend zum Abdruck zu bringen²⁷³.“

²⁷³ *Schönere Zukunft* v. 7. Februar 1933, zitiert nach *Documentation catholique* v. 28. Februar 1964. (Rückübersetzt. — Anm. d. Übers.)

Bei dieser Verurteilung des Nationalsozialismus durch die gesamte Kirche hat man im allgemeinen die Ansichten des damaligen Papstes Pius XI. nicht in Zweifel gezogen, sondern lediglich die seines Staatssekretärs Kardinal Pacelli, und das auch erst nach dem Kriege. Das war nur möglich, weil Kardinal Pacelli sich wenig darum kümmerte, Reklame für sich zu machen und seine persönliche Rolle hervorzuheben: Als wohlzogener Mensch wußte er, daß Pius XI. in den Vordergrund gerückt werden mußte und daß diesem überall der Vorrang vor ihm gebührte. Doch haben es andere glücklicherweise für ihn getan. Aus Anlaß eines Zwischenfalls im Jahre 1935 zwischen dem deutschen Staat und dem Episkopat (es ging dabei um die Transferierung von Devisen) schrieben deutsche katholische Emigranten, die in die Schweiz geflüchtet waren und in Luzern *Die deutschen Briefe* herausgaben, in der Nummer vom 26. August dieser Zeitschrift:

„... der Papst, Kardinal Pacelli und ein Teil des deutschen Episkopats wünschten, die Konferenz von Fulda [die vom 19. bis 23. zusammengetreten war, um zu dieser Angelegenheit Stellung zu nehmen] solle das Verbot, das den Katholiken die Mitgliedschaft in der NSDAP, den Jugendorganisationen oder anderen Organisationen der Partei untersagte, wieder in Kraft setzen.“

Dies hätte den Bruch des im Vorjahr zwischen dem Dritten Reich und dem Heiligen Stuhl unterzeichneten Konkordats bedeutet. Er wurde vermieden, jedoch nicht durch eine Konzession des Papstes, Kardinal Pacellis oder des Episkopats, sondern durch eine Konzession des Dritten Reiches im Verlauf einer Unterredung zwischen Dr. Kerrl, dem Reichsminister für kirchliche Angelegenheiten, und Kardinal Bertram, dem Vorsitzenden der Konferenz, am 19. August in Fulda selbst. Der Minister versprach, „die antichristlichen Extremisten der Partei zur Raison zu bringen“²⁷⁴, und Hitler bestätigte dieses Versprechen telegraphisch. Trotzdem veröffentlichte die Konferenz ein gemeinsames Schreiben der Bischöfe, das am 1. September 1935 in sämtlichen katholischen Kirchen Deutschlands verlesen wurde und das das Pariser Wochenblatt *Sept* (von François Mauriac!) am 19. desselben Monats unge-

²⁷⁴ *Die deutschen Briefe*, wie angegeben

kürzt mit dem Kommentar veröffentlichte: „Offene und deutliche Erklärungen ... Man hat einmütig beschlossen, das Neuheidentum [den Nationalsozialismus] zu bekämpfen und eine aktive Verteidigung dagegen zu organisieren.“ In Übereinstimmung mit Pius XI. und Kardinal Pacelli, die, wie wir gesehen haben, interveniert hatten. Alles dies beweist, daß damals niemandem der Gedanke kam, daß der künftige Papst Pius XII. dem Nationalsozialismus nicht von Grund aus feindlich gesonnen sei. Die Artikel der französischen Zeitungen *Le Populaire* (sozialistisch) und *L'Humanité* (kommunistisch), die seine Wahl begrüßten und die im Anhang zitiert sind²⁷⁵, beweisen, daß es 1939 noch genauso war. Die anderen, ebenfalls im Anhang aufgeführten Presseauszüge aus der Nachkriegszeit²⁷⁶ beweisen überdies, daß sich auch lange nach dem Kriege noch nichts daran geändert hatte.

Um mit der Rolle, die das religiöse Moment bei der Machtergreifung Hitlers spielte, zum Schluß zu kommen, muß folgendes festgestellt werden: Die deutschen Protestanten, die Pius XII. eine angeblich pronazistische Einstellung vorwerfen, sind für Hitler ein Erfolgsfaktor gewesen, gegenüber dem die katholische Kirche Pius XI., Kardinal Pacelli und der katholische Episkopat in Deutschland ohnmächtig waren. Wenn man berücksichtigt, daß in dem Deutschland der Jahre 1932/1933 die Protestanten nahezu zwei Drittel der Bevölkerung, die Katholiken hingegen nur ungefähr ein Drittel ausmachten, kann man sagen, daß sie in Wirklichkeit der katholischen Kirche und Kardinal Pacelli, dem Staatssekretär des Vatikans und späteren Pius XII., den Vorwurf machen, es nicht fertiggebracht zu haben, eine Situation aus der Welt zu schaffen, die sie, die Protestanten, selbst geschaffen hatten. Doch sehen wir weiter.

Bei jener feierlichen Eröffnungssitzung des neuen Reichstages am 21. März 1933 wurde die Erklärung Hitlers zur allgemeinen Politik mit 441 gegen 94 Stimmen angenommen. Anwesend waren 535 von insgesamt 648 Abgeordneten: Die fehlenden, insbesondere die gesamte kommunistische Fraktion sowie ein Dutzend

²⁷⁵ Vgl. unten Anhang I, S. 211–218.

²⁷⁶ Vgl. unten Anhang III, S. 226–231.

Sozialdemokraten waren festgenommen und außerstande gesetzt worden, an der Abstimmung teilzunehmen. Msgr. Kaas, der Wortführer des katholischen Zentrums, hatte das Wort ergriffen, um die Abstimmung *für* die Erklärung warm zu empfehlen, und seine Fraktion folgte ihm geschlossen. Doch Msgr. Kaas repräsentierte nicht die Meinung des katholischen Episkopats in Deutschland: Bekanntlich hatte die Fuldaer Konferenz am 19. Februar 1933, einige Tage bevor er am darauffolgenden 2. März unter dem Vorsitz und der Billigung Dr. Konrad Adenauers, des damaligen Bürgermeisters von Köln, seine Rede hielt, in der er eine Verständigung mit Hitler empfahl und sich für seine Absichten verbürgte, das Anathem des Episkopats gegen den Nationalsozialismus erneuert. Andererseits trat Msgr. Kaas am nachfolgenden 2. April von seinem Posten als Fraktionsvorsitzender des Zentrums zurück, und am 9. begleitete er unter dem Vorwand, bei den allerersten Verhandlungen für das Konkordat zwischen dem Dritten Reich und dem Heiligen Stuhl als Vermittler zu dienen, von Papen und Göring nach Rom, wo er gleichsam in der Versenkung verschwand: Er wurde in Deutschland nie wieder gesehen. Die meistvertretene allgemeine Ansicht geht dahin, daß der Heilige Stuhl ihn aus Unzufriedenheit über seine seit November 1932 gezeigte hitlerfreundliche Haltung kraft päpstlicher Autorität endgültig von der politischen Bühne abtreten ließ. Da sein Fall häufig als Beweis für die Sympathien der katholischen Kirche für Hitler angeführt wurde, ist es wichtig, dies zu betonen. Man kann sicher andere katholische Bischöfe anführen, die mit Recht der Willfährigkeit gegenüber dem Nationalsozialismus beschuldigt wurden: Msgr. Gröber aus Freiburg zum Beispiel oder Msgr. Berning aus Osnabrück. Doch das war erst *nach* Hitlers Machtergreifung, und außerdem stellen sie nur sehr seltene Ausnahmen von der allgemeinen Linie dar, während, wie wir gleich sehen werden, auf protestantischer Seite sowohl *vor* dem Triumph Hitlers als auch noch lange Zeit *danach* die Fälle von Feindseligkeit gegenüber Hitler unter den Bischöfen die Ausnahme bilden.

Doch kommen wir auf den Reichstag zurück: Auf die feierliche Eröffnungsversammlung vom 21. März, in der die Erklärung zur allgemeinen Politik mit 441 gegen 94 Stimmen (die der Sozial-

demokraten auf die Stellungnahme ihres Fraktionsführers hin) angenommen wurde, folgte zwei Tage später, am 23. März, eine andere Versammlung, in deren Verlauf Hitler mit den gleichen Stimmenverhältnis in der Form eines sogenannten Gesetzes zur Behebung der Not von Volk und Reich für vier Jahre unumschränkte Vollmachten erhielt. Bei der Vorlage dieses Gesetzes erklärte Hitler:

„Die Regierung beabsichtigt, von diesem Gesetz nur insoweit Gebrauch zu machen, als es zur Durchführung der lebensnotwendigen Maßnahmen erforderlich ist. Weder die Existenz des Reichstages noch des Reichsrates soll dadurch bedroht sein. Die Stellung und die Rechte des Reichspräsidenten bleiben unberührt ... Der Bestand der Länder wird nicht beseitigt. Die Rechte der Kirchen werden nicht geschmälert, ihre Stellung zum Staat nicht geändert ... Die Zahl der Fälle, in denen eine innere Notwendigkeit vorliegt, zu einem solchen Gesetz die Zuflucht zu nehmen, ist eine begrenzte²⁷⁷.“

Im Verlauf dieser Rede betonte er: „Ihre Sorge [die der Regierung] gilt dem aufrichtigen Zusammenleben zwischen Kirche und Staat ... [Insbesondere] legt die Reichsregierung ... den größten Wert darauf, die freundschaftlichen Beziehungen zum Heiligen Stuhle weiter zu pflegen und auszugestalten“, was eine unverhüllte Anspielung auf seinen Wunsch darstellte, ein Konkordat mit ihm abzuschließen.

Die Fuldaer Bischofskonferenz, die am 29. März 1933 zusammengetreten war, erklärte daraufhin:

„Es ist nunmehr anzuerkennen, daß von dem höchsten Vertreter der Reichsregierung, der zugleich autoritärer Führer jener Bewegung ist, ... feierlich Erklärungen gegeben sind, durch die der Unverletzlichkeit der katholischen Glaubenslehre (des katholischen Glaubens und der Missionen) und den unveränderlichen ... Rechten der Kirche Rechnung getragen sowie die vollinhaltliche Geltung der von den einzelnen deutschen Ländern mit der Kirche abgeschlossenen Staatsverträge ausdrücklich zugesichert wird²⁷⁸.“

In seinem Kommentar hierzu fügte Msgr. Preysing, der Erz-

²⁷⁷ Zitiert nach Shirer, *Aufstieg*, S. 195

bischof von Eichstätt, am 30. März hinzu: „Die Erklärungen des Reichskanzlers vom 23. März vor dem deutschen Reichstag berechtigen die Bischöfe, in der gegenwärtigen Stunde die bisher bekundete Opposition aufzugeben²⁷⁹.“ Es handelt sich wohlgerne um die Opposition gegen die Regierung, nicht um die Opposition gegen die nationalsozialistische Doktrin. Man beachte überdies die vorsichtige Ausdrucksweise: *in der gegenwärtigen Stunde*, sagte der Erzbischof, was nicht bedeutet: *endgültig*.

Sämtliche Bischöfe des Reiches gaben ihren Gläubigen die Erklärung von Fulda in den gleichen Worten wieder, und der *Osservatore Romano*²⁸⁰, also der Heilige Stuhl, billigte sie.

Der Waffenstillstand zwischen der Kirche und dem Dritten Reich war nicht von langer Dauer: nur gerade so lange, wie es für den Abschluß eines Konkordats erforderlich war. Es war kaum unterzeichnet, als auch schon der Kampf aus Anlaß der vielfachen Verletzungen, denen es seitens der Regierung des Dritten Reiches ausgesetzt wurde, wieder aufflammte. Es kamen die Protestnoten Kardinal Pacellis, die Enzyklika *Mit brennender Sorge*, die wiederholten Verurteilungen des Nationalsozialismus durch Kardinal Pacelli, der inzwischen Papst Pius XII. geworden war, usw. Wir werden nicht mehr darauf zurückkommen²⁸¹.

Wie verhielt sich währenddessen die protestantische Geistlichkeit gegenüber Hitler und dem Nationalsozialismus?

Erst Anfang 1934 begannen die Beziehungen zwischen dem Dritten Reich und der protestantischen Kirche sich zu verschlechtern, allerdings nur zwischen dem Dritten Reich und einer kleinen Minderheit von Pastoren. Es kam zu Meinungsverschiedenheiten über die Konstituierung der protestantischen Kirche als Reichskirche, ein von Hitler gehegtes Parallelprojekt zu seinem Plan eines Konkordats mit dem Heiligen Stuhl.

Zu Beginn fand dieses Projekt die Zustimmung der gesamten protestantischen Geistlichkeit. Zumindest erhob sich unter den

²⁷⁸ *Documentation catholique*, 8. April 1933. (Zitiert nach Hans Müller, *Katholische Kirche und Nationalsozialismus, Dokumente 1930–1935*, 1963, S. 76 ff. — Anm. d. Übers.)

²⁷⁹ *Documentation catholique*, 8. April 1933 (Rückübers. — Anm. d. Übers.)

²⁸⁰ Ebd., 3. April 1933

²⁸¹ Vgl. oben S. 65 ff.

17 000 Pastoren keine Stimme des Protestes. Andererseits waren, wie uns William Shirer sagt, darunter 3000 aktive Kämpfer der NSDAP. Sie hatten einen gewissen Ludwig Müller, den Militärgeistlichen des ostpreußischen Wehrkreises, einen Freund des Führers und überzeugten Nationalsozialisten, an ihrer Spitze.

Sie „vertraten [innerhalb der protestantischen Kirche] ... die [nationalsozialistische] Rassenlehre und das ... [Prinzip der deutschen Vormachtstellung] und wollten sie auf eine alle Protestanten zusammenfassende Reichskirche anwenden²⁸²“. Nachdem die Statuten dieser „Reichskirche“ von den Vertretern der verschiedenen protestantischen Kirchen Deutschlands — es gab davon 28 verschiedene Ausprägungen! — ausgearbeitet worden waren, wurde sie am 14. Juli vom Reichstag offiziell anerkannt. Wie erinnerlich, bestand der erste Vorwurf, der gegen Pius XII., den damaligen Kardinal Pacelli und Staatssekretär des Vatikans, erhoben wurde, darin, daß er damals im Hinblick auf die Unterzeichnung eines Konkordats trotz aller Untaten des Nationalsozialismus mit der Regierung des Dritten Reiches in Verbindung getreten war. Die Protestanten, die ihm diesen Vorwurf machten, haben schließlich das gleiche getan. Ebenso wurde bereits gesagt, daß zur gleichen Zeit auch die demokratischen Länder England und Frankreich — ebenfalls ungeachtet der Missetaten des Nationalsozialismus — in Hinblick auf die Unterzeichnung des berühmten Viererpaktes mit der Reichsregierung in Verbindung getreten waren. Die Logik aller dieser Leute besteht anscheinend darin, daß während des Sommers 1933 jedermann das moralische Recht hatte, mit dem Dritten Reich zu verhandeln, nur nicht der Heilige Stuhl! In der Tat eine bemerkenswerte Logik.

Da in den protestantischen Kreisen kein grundsätzlicher Einwand erhoben worden war, wurde der nächste Schritt in Angriff genommen: die Ernennung des „Papstes“ der neuen Kirche. Sie erfolgte Anfang September auf der Synode von Wittenberg. Und jetzt setzten die Schwierigkeiten ein. Die Delegierten dieser Synode waren für Pastor Friedrich von Bodelschwingh, der Führer hingegen für seinen Freund Ludwig Müller, was er am Vorabend

²⁸² Shirer, *Aufstieg*, S. 232

der Wahl öffentlich im Rundfunk kundtat. Nachdem Pastor Friedrich von Bodelschwingh seine Kandidatur zurückgezogen hatte, wurde Ludwig Müller einstimmig gewählt. Weder der Führer noch irgendeiner der protestantischen Geistlichen hatte an Pfarrer Dr. Martin Niemöller gedacht. Böse Zungen haben behauptet, er sei deswegen sehr gekränkt gewesen. Doch wenn es zutreffend wäre, daß diese Entscheidung den Keim für seine Opposition gegen Hitler in sich trug, müßte man einräumen, daß er es nicht sogleich zeigte. Er hatte vorher bei der Schaffung einer Pastorenvereinigung, des *Pfarrernotbundes*, mitgewirkt, und war dessen Vorsitzender geworden. Um nun über seine Absichten im Anschluß an die Ernennung Dr. Ludwig Müllers zum Oberhaupt der Reichskirche keine Mißverständnisse aufkommen zu lassen, richtete er an sämtliche Pastoren ein Rundschreiben, in dem es hieß: „Die Mitglieder des Pfarrernotbundes stehen unbedingt zu dem Führer Adolf Hitler²⁸³.“

Am nachfolgenden 14. Oktober, nachdem Deutschland den Völkerbund demonstrativ verlassen hatte, telegraphierte Präsident Niemöller im Namen des Pfarrernotbundes an den Reichskanzler Adolf Hitler:

„In dieser für Volk und Vaterland entscheidenden Stunde grüßen wir unseren Führer ... geloben wir treue Gefolgschaft und fürbittendes Gedenken²⁸³.“

Seine Tätigkeit im Namen dieser Organisation brachte ihn an die Spitze einer der 28 protestantischen Sekten Deutschlands, der *Bekennenden Kirche*, die eine Opposition gegen die kurz zuvor geschaffene *Reichskirche* zu bilden suchte.

Doch diese Opposition richtete ihre Schläge weit mehr gegen diese Kirche als gegen Hitler und den Nationalsozialismus, denn als es Hitler gelungen war, am 25. Januar 1934 die beiden Parteien zum Zweck eines Übereinkommens zusammenzubringen, erklärte das von Niemöller aufgenommene Protokoll dieser Zusammenkunft Hitler gegenüber noch immer: „... Wir brauchen Ihnen nicht zu versichern, wie dankbar wir Ihnen sind, daß Sie unser äußerlich und innerlich zersetztes Volk vom Abgrund weggeris-

²⁸³ *Deutsche National Zeitung* v. 16. April 1963

sen und zu neuer Entfaltung seiner Kräfte freigemacht haben²⁸³.“

Und man kehrte schlecht und recht unter die Fittiche Hitlers zurück, und die Meinungsverschiedenheiten zwischen der *Bekennenden Kirche* und den übrigen protestantischen Sekten blieben unverändert bestehen. In Wirklichkeit, wie uns nochmals William L. Shirer sagt, ließen diese Meinungsverschiedenheiten innerhalb der Geistlichkeit deutlich werden, „daß der Widerstand der protestantischen Kirchen [gegen die Nazifizierung lediglich] von einer Minderheit der Geistlichen und einer noch kleineren Minderheit der Gläubigen ausging²⁸⁴“.

Im Juli 1935 versuchte Hitler erneut, alle diese Meinungsverschiedenheiten zu beseitigen, die ihn zwar nicht beunruhigten, aber doch ärgerten. Er beauftragte daher den Reichsminister für kirchliche Angelegenheiten, Dr. Kerrl, eine erneute Zusammenkunft zu veranlassen. Hieraus ging ein *Reichskirchenausschuß* hervor, in dem Dr. Zoellner, ein ehrwürdiger, von allen protestantischen Gruppen geschätzter und geachteter Pastor, den Vorsitz führte. Dr. Martin Niemöller vertrat zwar den Standpunkt, daß seine protestantische Kirche die einzig wahre protestantische Kirche sei, erklärte sich jedoch zu einer Mitarbeit in diesem *Reichskirchenausschuß* bereit.

Im Mai 1936 richtete er an Hitler ein höfliches Schreiben, um gegen die antichristlichen Tendenzen des Regimes zu protestieren und ihn zu ersuchen, der Einmischung des Staates in die kirchlichen Angelegenheiten ein Ende zu setzen. Hitler verübelte ihm das nicht.

Erst am 27. Juni 1937 tat er mit einer über das Thema seines Schreibens vom Mai 1936 in seiner Kirche in Berlin-Dahlem gehaltenen Predigt öffentlich den Sprung in die Opposition. Diese Predigt enthielt eine Stelle, die eine Herausforderung bedeutete: „Wir gedenken ebensowenig von unseren eigenen Kräften Gebrauch zu machen, um dem Arm der Obrigkeit zu entgehen, wie ehemals die Apostel. Wir sind jedoch entschlossen, ebensowenig auf Befehl des Menschen zu schweigen, wenn Gott zu sprechen gebietet. Denn heute und immerdar müssen wir Gott mehr gehorchen als dem Menschen²⁸⁵.“

²⁸⁴ Shirer, *Aufstieg*, S. 233

²⁸⁵ Zitiert nach Shirer, *Le III^e Reich*, S. 261. (Rückübers. — Anm. d. Übers.)

Am 1. Juli wurde er verhaftet und ins Gefängnis eingeliefert. Am 2. März 1938 kam er dann vor ein Sondergericht, das ihn zu sieben Monaten Gefängnis und 2000 Mark Geldstrafe verurteilte. Die Gefängnisstrafe war durch die Untersuchungshaft abgegolten: Beim Verlassen des Gerichtssaales wurde er von der Gestapo festgenommen und als „persönlicher Gefangener des Führers“, was kein geringer Schutz war, in ein Konzentrationslager (für einige Monate nach Sachsenhausen, dann nach Dachau) geschickt. Erst die amerikanischen Truppen befreiten ihn aus diesem Lager.

Man kann mindestens sagen, daß sie ein wenig spät kam, diese Stellungnahme des Pastors Martin Niemöller, der sich im Jahre 1924 dem Nationalsozialismus angeschlossen und ihn von da an bei jeder Gelegenheit unterstützt hatte, insbesondere, wie man gesehen hat, in seinen Wahlkampagnen, der ferner Verfasser eines Buches war, das eine Verteidigungsschrift des Nationalsozialismus darstellte²⁸⁶ und mit einer Bemerkung endete, die seine Befriedigung zum Ausdruck brachte, daß die nationalsozialistische Revolution schließlich triumphiert und jenes nationale Wiedererwachen zur Folge gehabt habe.

Wenn man sicher wäre, daß dieser Sprung in die Opposition nicht suspekt wäre, würde man gern sagen: „Besser spät als nie.“ Doch was soll man von jenem Brief halten, den er im September 1939, nachdem der Krieg ausgebrochen war, während er doch seit Juli 1937 inhaftiert war, an seinen Freund Großadmiral Raeder schrieb: „Da ich bislang vergeblich auf meine Einberufung zum Dienst gewartet habe, ... melde ich mich nunmehr ausdrücklich als Freiwilliger ... Ich bin 47 Jahre alt, körperlich und geistig völlig leistungsfähig und bitte um irgendeine Verwendung im Kriegsdienst“²⁸⁷.

Freiwilliger in den Armeen des Nationalsozialismus, bei voller Kenntnis hinsichtlich der von ihm verfolgten Ziele — das wirft

²⁸⁶ *Vom U-Boot zur Kanzel*, Warneck, Berlin 1934. (Pastor Martin Niemöller war während des Ersten Weltkrieges U-Boot-Kommandant.) Das Buch wurde im nationalsozialistischen Deutschland zu einem echten Bestseller und erlebte zahlreiche Auflagen. Die Werbung dafür wurde von der nationalsozialistischen Presse gemacht.

²⁸⁷ *Deutsche National Zeitung*, 16. April 1963

nun doch ein eigenartiges Licht auf die Natur und die Aufrichtigkeit seiner „Opposition gegen das Regime“.

Solch ein Mann ist in Deutschland eine hervorragende Persönlichkeit — ein Mann, der, nachdem er jahrelang die Menschen, auf die er einen gewissen Einfluß ausübte, veranlaßt hatte, sich dem Nationalsozialismus anzuschließen, und der, nachdem er offenbar nur deshalb mühelos aus dem Abenteuer herausgekommen war, weil Hitler ihn in seinen Armeen nicht haben wollte, anschließend forderte, gegen diejenigen, die seinem Rat gefolgt waren, erbarungslos vorzugehen. Und der sich ferner unter den gewichtigsten Anklägern Pius' XII. und glühendsten Anhängern Rolf Hochhuths — der im übrigen eines seiner Schäflein ist — befindet.

Die Verhaftung Pastor Niemöllers stürzte die ihres Hauptes beraubte Bekennende Kirche in Verwirrung: Man hörte kaum noch etwas von ihr. Im anderen protestantischen Lager war am 12. Februar 1937 Dr. Zoellner aus dem Reichskirchenausschuß ausgetreten, weil die Polizei des Dritten Reiches ihn daran gehindert hatte, sich zu Nachforschungen nach Lübeck zu begeben, wo neun protestantische Pastoren verhaftet worden waren. Am Ende des Jahres erklärte sein Nachfolger Dr. Marahrens, der Bischof von Hannover, öffentlich, „daß die nationalsozialistische Weltanschauung als nationale und politische Lehre für das deutsche Volk bestimmend und als solche auch für deutsche Christen verpflichtend sei“. Im Frühjahr 1938 ging er sogar so weit, für sämtliche Pastoren seiner Diözese anzuordnen, einen persönlichen Treueid auf den Führer zu leisten. „In kurzer Zeit“, sagt uns William L. Shirer, „kam die große Mehrheit der evangelischen Geistlichen der Anweisung nach²⁸⁸.“ Und in ganz Deutschland war es ebenso. Daß sich Pastoren der Nazifizierung der deutschen protestantischen Kirche widersetzen, steht außer Zweifel: Hunderte und aber Hunderte sind verhaftet und in die Konzentrationslager geschickt worden. Doch ebenso sind auch Hunderte und aber Hunderte von katholischen Priestern verhaftet worden und in die Konzentrationslager gewandert. Was wir sagen wollen, ist nur, daß die protestantischen Widerstandskämpfer sich *gegen* die allgemeine Linie ihrer Kirche

²⁸⁸ Shirer, *Aufstieg*, S. 234 f.

wandten, während die katholischen Widerstandskämpfer *in* der allgemeinen Linie ihrer Kirche standen. Man wird mir verzeihen, daß ich mich so häufig auf William L. Shirer berufe, doch schließlich ist er selbst Protestant, und trotzdem hat keiner besser als er das allgemeine Verhalten der Gesamtheit der deutschen Protestanten charakterisiert, der Pastoren und Schäflein gemeinsam, die zwischen den Anhängern einer zur nationalsozialistischen Reichskirche umgewandelten protestantischen Kirche und den Verfechtern der totalen politischen Unabhängigkeit der protestantischen Kirche hin und her gerissen wurden: „Zwischen beiden Gruppen“, so schreibt er, „stand die Mehrheit der Protestanten, die offenbar zu zaghaft war, sich zu der einen oder anderen Gruppe zu bekennen, . . . und schließlich größtenteils in Hitlers Armen landete, . . . seine Einmischung in kirchliche Angelegenheiten hinnahm und sich seinen Befehlen ohne offenen Widerspruch beugte²⁸⁹.“

Und auch ohne irgendwelchen anderen Widerspruch.

Diese Feststellungen haben keinen sehr großen Indikativen Wert: Man muß die Furcht in Rechnung stellen, die das Regime der Geistlichkeit und der Masse der deutschen Protestanten einflößte. Doch schließlich erweckte dieses Regime bei den Katholiken die gleiche Furcht und bewirkte bei ihnen trotzdem nicht, daß sie „größtenteils“, der Klerus an der Spitze, „in Hitlers Armen“ landeten und „seine Einmischung in kirchliche Angelegenheiten“ hinnahmen. Man muß auch zugeben, daß die Katholiken gegenüber den Protestanten einen beachtlichen Vorteil besaßen: einen Nuntius in Berlin und einen Papst in Rom, der erstere unverletzlich und der zweite außerhalb der Reichweite von Repressalien, die in ihrem Namen Protest erheben konnten und sich dessen auch nicht enthielten. Aber jedenfalls war es ein katholischer Bischof, Msgr. Graf von Galen aus Münster, und nicht ein protestantischer Bischof, der sich gegen die Euthanasie erhob . . .

Es war notwendig, das Verhalten der protestantischen Kirche, ihrer Bischöfe und ihrer insgesamt 17 000 Pastoren im einzelnen ins Gedächtnis zu rufen. Wir haben es nicht aus freien Stücken getan. „Für jede Sünde Barmherzigkeit“ — wenn dies das Gesetz des

²⁸⁹ Ebd., S. 232

Gottes der Christen ist, so ist es auch das des Gewissens der Atheisten, obgleich es leider nicht das der Menschen im allgemeinen ist. Wenn diese Kirche nicht dieses Gesetz ihres eigenen Gottes so weit vergessen hätte, daß sie das Gewissen eines Unschuldigen mit einer Sünde belastete, die sie und nicht er begangen hat, und sich nicht heute zur Anklägerin aufwürfe, hätten wir uns wohl davor gehütet. Und wenn wir es getan haben, so nicht nach Art eines Hochhuth, um irgendwelche x-beliebigen Verwünschungen gegen sie auszustoßen, sondern lediglich, um an das alte Sprichwort von dem Dieb zu erinnern, der „Haltet den Dieb!“ schreit. Wenn man von den Prinzipien zu den Tatsachen hinabsteigt, weiß man andererseits sehr wohl, daß unter einer Diktatur wie auch im Kriege der Mensch die Maßstäbe seines Handelns verliert und sein Verhalten sich jeglichem Werturteil entzieht. Ich habe das im Konzentrationslager (in der gleichen Weise wie Louise Michel) sowie bei Kampfhandlungen im Kriege persönlich erfahren. Alle Vernunft ist ausgeschaltet, bei den Männern des Glaubens in noch viel stärkerem Maße. Und in diesem Punkt wird uns vor Pius XII. Achtung abgenötigt: Das Verhalten dieses Mannes des Glaubens nämlich wurde von rationalen Grundsätzen bestimmt, die im Gegensatz zu denen des Glaubens stets menschlich sind.

Unter der Diktatur Hitlers also: Nehmen wir das zur Kenntnis und gehen wir weiter. Doch vorher?

Für die Zeit vorher bleibt die Tatsache bestehen, daß die gesamte protestantische Geistlichkeit und selbst jene kleine Minderheit, die später, erst viel später, in die Opposition ging und deren typischster Vertreter Pastor Niemöller ist, für Hitler Partei ergriffen und zu einem der Faktoren für seinen Erfolg wurden, obgleich Deutschland Republik war und keinerlei Druck ausgeübt wurde. Der katholische Klerus, der Heilige Stuhl, Pius XI. und Kardinal Pacelli, der spätere Pius XII., dagegen . . .²⁹⁰

Auch jene Sünde wird der protestantischen Kirche vergeben werden, denn in den Wirren jener Zeit . . . (siehe oben). Und, wie dem auch sei, auch das steht in der Heiligen Schrift: „Dem, der viel gesündigt hat, wird viel vergeben werden.“ Auf Grund dessen

²⁹⁰ Vgl. die Beschlüsse der aufeinanderfolgenden Fuldaer Bischofskonferenzen oben S. 174

wird man ihr sogar eine noch weitaus schwerere Sünde vergeben, nämlich die, daß sie sich heute zur Anklägerin aufwirft. Doch wenn man so alles vergeben hat, behält man trotzdem das Recht zu sagen, daß man es gern gesehen hätte, daß von ihr diese letzte Sünde nicht begangen worden wäre. Möge die protestantische Kirche sich doch darüber klar werden, daß, wenn sich in dieser Angelegenheit jemand erlauben durfte, Anklage zu erheben, dann nicht sie es war. Und möge sie, wenn sich zufällig einer ihrer Gläubigen, der sich wie Hochhuth so weit verirrt hat, daß er jegliches moralische Gefühl verloren hat, bis zu einer solchen Schändlichkeit wie dem *Stellvertreter* hinreißen läßt, es nur zum Anlaß nehmen, ihre eigene Schuld einzugestehen und so demütig wie möglich einem Menschen Achtung zu erweisen, der, obwohl er Papst war, dennoch vor dem Nationalsozialismus und dem Krieg weit mehr Größe bewies als irgendeiner ihrer Pastoren und selbst, wenn man sie alle zu einem riesigen Bündel zusammenfassen würde, mehr als sie alle zusammen.

Ich weiß wohl, warum sie das nicht getan hat:

Da ist zunächst jene bereits erwähnte allgemeine Geisteshaltung, die nur sehr wenige Menschen zu überwinden vermögen: die Haltung derjenigen, die im Bewußtsein ihrer eigenen Schuld sich ein gutes Gewissen zu verschaffen suchen, indem sie einen ebenso Schuldigen oder noch Schuldigeren als sie selbst zu finden trachten. Es ist ein instinktmäßiges und durchaus menschliches Verhalten. Menschlich in dem Sinne, in dem dieses Adjektiv eine Schwäche des Menschen hinsichtlich seiner Einsicht in die Dinge bezeichnet, in einem Sinne, der dem Humanismus diametral entgegengesetzt ist. Hinzu kommt in diesem besonderen Fall die den Protestanten angeborene antipäpstliche Einstellung, der Kern ihrer Lehre. Und schließlich die durch den Zweiten Weltkrieg geschaffene völlig neue politische Situation, in der sich die protestantische Kirche Deutschlands heute befindet.

Das aus dem protestantischen Preußen hervorgegangene, im Zeichen des *Kulturkampfes* entstandene Deutschland des Jahres 1914 war ein Reich, in dem Protestanten und Katholiken sich im Verhältnis zwei zu eins gegenüberstanden. Der Kaiser war Protestant, der Reichskanzler war Protestant und die Führer der Armee und

der Polizei waren ebenfalls Protestanten. Die protestantische Kirche übte in diesem Deutschen Reich einen beträchtlichen Einfluß auf die Politik aus. Ein hoher katholischer Staatsbeamter wäre nicht denkbar gewesen.

Der Kulturkampf, Ausdruck eines liberalen Prinzips, war aus der Reaktion Bismarcks gegen die Politik Pius' IX. und insbesondere gegen das Dogma von der päpstlichen Unfehlbarkeit entstanden, das dieser Papst am 18. Juli 1870 durch ein Konzil (Erstes Vatikanisches Konzil) verkünden ließ. Auf Regierungsebene äußerte sich der Kulturkampf durch Ausnahmegesetze gegen die Katholiken (Unterdrückung der Freiheit der Kirche, obwohl diese z. B. durch die preußische Verfassung von 1850 garantiert worden war). Die Protestanten waren nicht davon betroffen. Hätten sich diese Gesetze nur auf Preußen erstreckt, so hätten daraus keine ernsthaften Nachteile entstehen können, obgleich sie von himmelschreierender Ungerechtigkeit waren. Da sie jedoch ganz Deutschland betrafen, bewirkten sie, daß sich das katholische Drittel der Bevölkerung gerade in dem Augenblick gegen Bismarck zusammenschloß, in dem es dem aufsteigenden Marxismus gelang, nahezu ein weiteres Drittel um sich zu scharen. Um im Reichstag nicht überstimmt zu werden, mußte Bismarck nachgeben (1880, sog. Friedensgesetz). Da die Katholiken keinerlei Konzessionen gemacht hatten, bedeutete dies die erste politische Niederlage des deutschen Protestantismus, der mit der Beendigung des Kulturkampfes sein einträglichstes Propagandamittel einbüßte.

Von da an hörte die katholische Kirche nicht mehr auf, ihren Einfluß auf die deutsche Politik auszuüben und in zunehmendem Maße zu erweitern — im Wettbewerb mit der protestantischen Kirche. Die Fortschritte waren langsam — sogar sehr langsam. Die höchsten staatlichen Ämter blieben noch lange Zeit hindurch den Protestanten vorbehalten, und erst 1930 wurde ein Katholik, Dr. Brüning, Reichskanzler. Als Hitler an die Regierung kam, war jedoch auf konfessionellem Gebiet der protestantische Einfluß vorherrschend, und obgleich Hitler seiner Herkunft nach Katholik war, empfand er persönlich weit mehr Sympathie für die protestantische als für die katholische Kirche: Allein die Tatsache, daß er daran gedacht hatte, eine Nationalkirche des Reiches daraus zu

machen, beweist dies unbestreitbar. Man könnte sogar hinzufügen, daß von jeher, seit der Entstehung Deutschlands, es nahezu einmütig die protestantischen Kreise waren, die den deutschen Nationalismus in seiner extremsten Form zum Ausdruck brachten — eine weitere Brücke also zwischen Hitler und ihnen. Man hat diesen Nationalismus als „preußisch“ bezeichnet. Einverstanden, doch ich stelle die Frage: preußisch, weil er protestantisch, oder protestantisch, weil er preußisch war?

Mit dem Ende des Zweiten Weltkrieges ging auch der überwiegende Einfluß des Protestantismus auf die deutsche Politik zu Ende. Zunächst wurde Deutschland in zwei Teile geteilt: 17 bis 18 Millionen seiner Einwohner kamen auf die östliche Seite des Eisernen Vorhanges, 51 bis 52 Millionen auf die westliche Seite. Doch gerade jene 17 bis 18 Millionen Deutsche, die von Deutschland abgetrennt wurden, sind Protestanten. Diese Tatsache hat zwei Folgen:

1. Auf der anderen Seite des Eisernen Vorhanges, die der kommunistischen Diktatur unterworfen ist, sind der protestantischen Geistlichkeit gewisse Stellungnahmen verboten, und allem Anschein nach erträgt sie diese Verbote ebenso widerspruchslos wie einst diejenigen, die ihr durch das Hitlerregime auferlegt wurden. Insbesondere läßt sie sich sehr bereitwillig zu der sowjetischen Friedenslehre hinführen. Und die protestantische Geistlichkeit in Westdeutschland richtet sich nach ihr aus: Pastor Martin Niemöller, der U-Boot-Kommandant des Ersten Weltkrieges und Verfasser eines Buches, das das Glaubensbekenntnis eines fanatischen Nationalisten darstellt und mit einer begeisterten Zustimmungserklärung zu der „nationalsozialistischen Revolution“ endet, jener Freiwillige, der sich 1939 für eine Wiederverwendung im Kriegsdienst in den Armeen Hitlers meldete, ist heute der einflußreichste protestantische Geistliche und steht an der Spitze einer Friedensbewegung, die systematisch sämtliche Friedensparolen der Sowjetunion für sich in Anspruch nimmt. Die deutschen Pazifisten haben für die Lenkung ihrer Geschicke nichts Besseres gefunden. Kurz, der Eisernen Vorhang ist für die in 28 Teile aufgespaltene protestantische Kirche Deutschlands keineswegs ein zusätzlich trennender, sondern weit mehr ein verbindender Faktor gewesen, und zwar

insofern, als er es den einzelnen Teilen ermöglicht, von Zeit zu Zeit eine Einheit der Anschauungen zu bekunden, zumindest über einen Punkt: den Frieden. Dies ist im übrigen ganz allgemein eine Tradition des Protestantismus: In eine Unzahl von Sekten mit gegensätzlicher Auffassung über Glaubensfragen aufgespalten, hat er niemals einen Weg gefunden, seine Einheit zu bekräftigen, außer über Probleme, die der Religion, zu der er sich bekennt, fernliegen.

2. Während die protestantische Kirche Deutschlands jenseits des Eisernen Vorhanges in ihren öffentlichen Stellungnahmen durch das Regime auf die Rolle eines Mittlers der *Pax sovietica* beschränkt wird — wobei ihr dieses Regime, nebenbei gesagt, wie allen Kirchen in der Ausübung ihrer Religion rechtlich nicht mehr Freiheit als einer Privatperson zugesteht —, wird sie in Westdeutschland in ihrem politischen Einfluß durch ein Zahlenverhältnis eingeschränkt: Im Jahre 1965 stehen sich dort Protestanten und Katholiken nicht mehr — wie in dem Deutschland vor 1914 oder zwischen den beiden Weltkriegen — im Verhältnis zwei zu eins, sondern nur noch im Verhältnis sechs zu fünf²⁹¹ gegenüber, d. h. zahlenmäßig ziemlich gleich, mit einem leichten Übergewicht der Protestanten. Politisch drückt sich diese Situation folgendermaßen aus: Wenn der Bundespräsident protestantisch ist (Heuss), ist der Bundeskanzler katholisch (Adenauer), und auf diese Mannschaft folgte ein katholischer Präsident (Lübke) und ein protestantischer Kanzler (Erhard). So als hätten die beiden Kirchen innerhalb der CDU/CSU einen Kompromiß geschlossen, einen Kompromiß, der weder der einen noch der anderen zusagt und bei dem eine jede die andere überwacht, bereit, die geringste Gelegenheit zu ergreifen, durch die sie über die andere die Oberhand gewinnen kann. Der außergewöhnliche Erfolg Bundeskanzler Adenauers wirkt zugunsten der Katholiken, die sich auf Grund ihrer Haltung gegenüber dem Nationalsozialismus bereits in einer günstigen Position

²⁹¹ In abgerundeten Zahlen kann die Bevölkerung der Bundesrepublik Deutschland nach ihrem Bekenntnis folgendermaßen veranschlagt werden: Insgesamt: 53 Millionen Einwohner; Protestanten: zwischen 27 und 28 Millionen; Katholiken: zwischen 23 und 24 Millionen; konfessionslos und sonstige Bekenntnisse: der Rest.

befinden: Sie haben den Wind im Rücken. Gegen die Protestanten wirkt die Unterstützung, die sie Hitler auf seinem Weg zur Macht leisteten, sowie jener Kryptokommunismus, durch den sie glauben sich rehabilitieren zu können. Sie sind sich dessen bewußt geworden. Und dann kam der *Stellvertreter*, dessen Ziel es war, den Katholiken einen Schlag zu versetzen, von dem sie sich nicht erholen würden, und der gleichzeitig sie, die Protestanten, als eines der wesentlichen Elemente des Widerstandes gegen Hitler erscheinen lassen sollte.

Dies ist der erste Aspekt des Unternehmens *Stellvertreter*: ein Argument der Protestanten, um in Westdeutschland den politischen Einfluß der Katholiken zu bekämpfen und, was zweifellos dabei wesentlich ist, um eine Anhängerschaft zu vergrößern oder zumindest zu bewahren, welche ihr politisches Verhalten in der Vergangenheit und Gegenwart zuletzt äußerst unsicher gemacht hat. Daß sämtliche protestantische Kirchen der Welt wie ein Mann das Argument ihrerseits aufgegriffen haben, ist nur allzu natürlich, denn es ist in seiner Form das antipäpstliche Argument par excellence. Doch wir haben soeben gesehen, daß es in seinem Kern, wie Kipling sagen würde, etwas ganz anderes ist.

Das Argument eines Krämers übrigens, eines Krämers aus den Uranfängen des Handels: „Hier alles zum gleichen Preis, aber besser als gegenüber! Der Beweis dafür . . . “ Ein Argument, an dem der Kunde von heute nur noch mit einem Lächeln ob dieser Naivität vorübergeht. Im Verlauf der Debatte hat eine der unzähligen gegen den Katholizismus protestierenden Sekten sehr offenherzig — und altmodisch — das verfolgte Ziel eingestanden, indem sie sich auf die Heilige Schrift berief: „Gehet aus von ihr [der katholischen Kirche], mein Volk, daß ihr nicht teilhaftig werdet ihrer Sünden, auf daß ihr nicht empfanget etwas von ihren Plagen! Denn ihre Sünden reichen bis an den Himmel, und Gott denkt an ihren Frevel²⁹².“

Sprich: Gehet aus von ihr und kommt zu uns.

Zu diesem Schluß gelangen sie alle: Der letzte Krämer unserer Zeit in dem abgelegensten Dörfchen ist geschickter.

²⁹² *Réveillez-vous!* (Organ der Zeugen Jehovas), 22. Juli 1964, S. 19. Bei der angeführten Stelle handelt es sich um Offenbarung 18, 4—5.

III. DIE EINHEITSFRONT GEGEN DEN PAPST

Es gilt jetzt, die Beweggründe zu analysieren, durch die die Gegner der katholischen Kirche, die sich mit der protestantischen zu dieser Art von „Einheitsfront“ verbündet haben, geleitet wurden.

Nur zur Erinnerung verweilen wir bei jener geistigen Bewegung, die zu Beginn dieses Jahrhunderts, als der Sozialismus seine Einheit verwirklicht und die Gewerkschaftsbewegung ihren Weg gefunden hatte und als die Arbeiterschaft mit der Parole: „Der Kapitalismus — das ist der Feind!“ zum Sturm auf das Regime ansetzte, diese davon ablenkte, indem sie ihr darlegte, daß der Feind nicht der Kapitalismus, sondern der Klerikalismus sei: „Der Klerikalismus — das ist der Feind!“ Die Ablenkung gelang ausgezeichnet. Seitdem unterscheidet sich die europäische Linke von der Rechten nur noch durch einen Antiklerikalismus, der 30 Jahre später bis auf geringe Abweichungen zu einer Neuauflage des Kulturkampfes wurde. Während die Arbeiterschaft damit beschäftigt war, sich mit den katholischen Pfarrern zu schlagen, festigte das Regime in aller Ruhe sein inneres Gefüge und bereitete nicht weniger ruhig den Ersten Weltkrieg vor. Wie es weiterging, ist bekannt: Die Arbeiterbewegung hat sich niemals davon erholt! Jenem Antiklerikalismus selbst widerfuhr das gleiche Schicksal wie dem Kulturkampf: In der gleichen Weise wie Bismarck gegenüber Leo XIII. nachgeben müssen, mußten die sozial Konservativen, die die Bewegung lanciert hatten, um die vor der Regierungsübernahme versprochenen Reformen nicht durchführen zu müssen, gegenüber Pius IX. nachgeben: von sich aus die Beziehungen zum Vatikan wiederherstellen, nach und nach die Ausnahmegesetze gegen die katholische Kirche aufheben usw. Der Antiklerikalismus ging daran zugrunde. In Frankreich, wo er am heftigsten war und den meisten Erfolg hatte, versuchen kleine Sekten ihn wiederaufleben zu lassen. Vergeblich. Ihre furchtbarsten Waffen sind die kleine Leder-schürze, das Winkelmaß, der Zirkel und die Wurst am Karfreitag. Es ist nicht wahr, daß das Lächerliche nicht mehr tötet.

Im Prinzip jedoch war die Trennung von Kirche und Staat eine sehr gute Sache. Nur hätte sie bedeuten müssen: „Eine freie Kirche in einem freien Staat“ gemäß der Formel Viktor Emanuels II.,

d. h. eine Kirche, die letztlich auf den Status einer politischen Partei reduziert worden wäre, mit den gleichen Rechten wie alle anderen. Jedoch im Stadium der Durchführung bedeutete sie die Verdrängung der katholischen Kirche zugunsten einer anderen, deren Religion der Staat und deren Priester bei der Kommunion mit dem großen Baumeister des Universums die Lehrer sein sollten. Und noch dazu mit Hilfe von Ausnahmegesetzen. Einzig und allein durch Überraschung hat man es fertigbringen können, daß der Taschenspielertrick zu Beginn dieses Jahrhunderts gelang. Aber nicht für lange. Die Wurstesser vom Karfreitag, mit dem kleinen Lederschurz, dem Winkelmaß und dem Zirkel, die von einer Rückkehr zu jenen glücklichen Zeiten träumen, in denen ihr Ansehen hell erstrahlte, müssen sich ins Unvermeidliche schicken. Die Geschichte wiederholt sich nicht. Auf jeden Fall hat sie sich in dieser Hinsicht nicht wiederholt.

Väterchen Combes ist nicht wieder aus dem Grabe auferstanden, und seine verspäteten Jünger sind für das Ausmaß der durch den *Stellvertreter* ausgelösten Debatte nicht entscheidend gewesen. Das Ausmaß wurde vielmehr durch den Bolschewismus und den internationalen Zionismus bestimmt. Und obgleich ihre beiderseitigen Stellungnahmen in dieser Angelegenheit nicht die gleiche Absicht verfolgen, sind sie ihnen alle beide durch die deutsche Frage, so wie sie sich durch den Ausgang des Zweiten Weltkrieges stellte, eingegeben worden. Da sie die gleichen Wege benutzen, müssen sie überdies ganz sicher zum gleichen Endergebnis gelangen: zum Untergang der Freiheit in Europa, und zwar dadurch, daß Europa selbst unter den Einfluß des Bolschewismus gerät.

Ich habe häufig gesagt und geschrieben, daß der Bolschewismus unter dem Deckmantel einer Weltrevolution, die alle Völker vom kapitalistischen Joch befreien soll, nur die moderne Form jenes Panslawismus ist, den unter demselben Deckmantel der Panschintoismus seit kurzem zu betreiben sucht. Unter Stalin kam man schließlich zu der Auffassung, daß nicht mehr die Befreiung der Völker durch die Revolution das Ziel sei, sondern daß mit Hilfe eines Krieges die bolschewistische Herrschaft auf ganz Europa ausgedehnt werden solle, das in wirtschaftliche und soziale Strukturen eingezwängt worden sei, die weit hinter denen des liberalen

Kapitalismus zurückstünden, die gegenwärtig in Rußland vorherrschen. Das zeigt, wie jener Sozialismus beschaffen ist, und führt gleichzeitig jene Revolution auf ihre richtigen Proportionen, nämlich die einer Bauernfängerei, zurück.

Wie die Erfahrung zeigt, haben sich die Berechnungen Stalins nur zur Hälfte als falsch erwiesen. Zwar ist es ihm nicht gelungen, Rußland aus dem Zweiten Weltkrieg herauszuhalten, doch hat dieser Krieg immerhin die Hälfte Mitteleuropas dem Panslawismus ausgeliefert und seine Grenzen bis auf 50 Kilometer an Hamburg herangerückt. Soll nur Westdeutschland zusammenbrechen, dann ist der Weg zum Atlantik für ihn frei. Jedesmal also, wenn ein Schritt in Richtung auf die Rückgliederung Westdeutschlands — und, auf dem Wege über die Wiedervereinigung, selbst die Ostdeutschlands — in die übrigens allen offenstehende europäische Völkergemeinschaft unternommen wird, ergehen sich die Nachfolger Stalins in Schmähungen gegen den deutschen Militarismus, gegen die neonazistischen Bonner Revanchisten, gegen das für den Zweiten Weltkrieg verantwortliche Deutschland, die Kriegsverbrecher usw. Das ist ihr moralisches Argument. Es soll in der öffentlichen Meinung jene offensichtliche Lüge zugkräftig erhalten, die durch die dreizehn Nürnberger Prozesse in den Rang einer geschichtlichen Wahrheit erhoben wurde, daß Deutschland, da allein für den Zweiten Weltkrieg verantwortlich, auch allein die Last der Wiedergutmachung der angerichteten Schäden zu übernehmen habe.

Deutschland bezahlen lassen, jetzt und immerdar, heißt, es zum wirtschaftlichen Zusammenbruch treiben. Mit Hilfe des sich daraus ergebenden Chaos hoffen die Nachfolger Stalins zuversichtlich, es in ihre Gewalt zu bringen.

Und das wird das Ende des freiheitlichen Europas sein, denn ohne ein freies, selbständiges und gleichberechtigt in die Gemeinschaft der Völker des alten Kontinents wiedereingegliedertes Deutschland ist jenes Europa undenkbar. Dann werden die Grenzen des Panslawismus einen weiteren beachtlichen Schritt nach Westen verlagert worden sein, und der Bolschewismus wird kaum mehr etwas unternehmen müssen, damit sie mit der Atlantikküste zusammenfallen.

So sehen die Berechnungen des Bolschewismus aus.

Und so das Unternehmen, dem die gesamte protestantische Geistlichkeit aus Gründen des religiösen Prestiges im Staate soeben mit dem *Stellvertreter* ein Propagandaargument lieferte und dem die internationale zionistische Bewegung sich aus materiellen Gründen anschloß. Denn durch die erneute Bekräftigung der Alleinschuld Deutschlands wird in der Tat die Zahlung jener Entschädigungssummen gerechtfertigt, die ihr die Konsolidierung des Staates Israel und den „Wiederaufbau des jüdischen Lebens“ in der Welt ermöglichen. Weisen wir beiläufig darauf hin, daß diese „Wiedergutmachungssummen“ nur von Westdeutschland gezahlt werden! Ihr Betrag ist so hoch, daß das, was 1919 durch den Versailler Vertrag gefordert wurde, im Vergleich dazu eine Bagatelle war. (Siehe Anhang V)

Doch die christlichen Progressisten? Zunächst einmal sind sie darum bemüht, sich ein gutes Gewissen zu verschaffen und Verzeihung zu erwirken für die Haltung, die sie, taub gegen die Appelle Pius' XII., *angesichts* und *während* des Krieges eingenommen haben — eine Haltung, die während des Krieges häufig zweideutig war: Ich kenne Fälle von Leuten, die heute sehr von oben herab reden und die . . . Nun ja! Darüber hinaus jedoch quält sie die Versuchung des Marxismus, dessen Methoden in ihren Augen allein die katholische Kirche zu retten vermögen: die Öffnung nach links. Gerade in dem Augenblick, in dem die Erfahrung Rußlands den Beweis für den Bankrott des Marxismus erbracht hat und in dem in der übrigen Welt die Linke gesellschaftlich nur noch einen Mythos darstellt, der durch den Bolschewismus künstlich unterhalten wird, der im politischen Fächer nicht links, sondern östlich steht, d. h. an der äußersten Rechten, und zwar sehr wahrscheinlich noch weiter rechts als die alten Parteien, die wir gewöhnlich dort einordnen. Denn an der äußersten Rechten steht der Totalitarismus, und zwar ganz gleich, unter welcher doktrinären Farbe auch immer er sich versteckt. In bezug auf den Totalitarismus aber können jene alten Parteien dem Bolschewismus nicht, bei weitem nicht, das Wasser reichen. Was hier gesagt werden soll, ist, daß man von dem Augenblick an, in dem man von einer Öffnung nach links spricht und sich dabei nur noch an den Bolschewis-

mus wendet, erstens die Öffnung nach der äußersten Rechten, also der schlimmsten, hin vornimmt und daß zweitens alles, wozu man gelangen kann, bedeutet, ihm in die Hände zu arbeiten. Wenn man überdies aus Sorge um die Lehre die Kirche mit dem marxistischen Denksystem ausstatten will, kann man nur noch um so sicherer dahin kommen. Und noch rascher: Es ist bekannt, in welches Abenteuer kürzlich die Öffnung nach links, mit dem Segen desjenigen, den man den guten Papst Johannes XXIII. nennt, Italien beinahe gestürzt hätte. Und man erschauert bei dem Gedanken, was hätte geschehen können, wenn die italienische Geistlichkeit marxistisch gewesen wäre! Die bolschewistische Politik der „den Katholiken dargebotenen Hand“, jenes Bolschewismus, der sie im Osten mit der Knute behandelt, ist im Westen lediglich eine Neuauflage des Grundsatzes von dem „Vogel, den man zu rupfen gedenkt“, jenes Grundsatzes, den der Bolschewismus seit fünfzig Jahren mit soviel Erfolg gegenüber dem Sozialismus praktiziert. Die Erfahrung lehrt, daß seine Technik auf diesem Gebiet äußerst bewährt ist. Der geringste Vertrag, den man mit ihm schließt, das geringste Zugeständnis gegenüber seinen Methoden oder seiner Lehre läuft darauf hinaus, daß man den Wolf in den Schafstall einläßt, wo er stärker ist als alle Schafe zusammen.

Es ist lediglich eine Frage des Kräfteverhältnisses.

Und diejenigen, die der Versuchung unterliegen, sind politisch blind.

Nachdem dies gesagt ist, mag sich die katholische Kirche ruhig wandeln, ja sogar aus dem geistigen Leben der Völker verschwinden, wie sie aus ihrem materiellen Leben verschwunden oder doch nahezu verschwunden ist — der Verfasser dieser Studie sieht darin, wie der Leser bereits verstanden hat, keinerlei Nachteil, im Gegenteil. Doch wenn sie dabei ihre Anhängerschaft dem Bolschewismus überläßt, sieht die Sache ganz anders aus.

Zu diesen rein politischen Motiven, die über das Thema des *Stellvertreter* Protestanten, Juden, christliche Progressisten und Bolschewisten zu einer gemeinsamen Offensive gegen die katholische Kirche zusammengeführt haben, muß noch ein ausschließlich religiöser Beweggrund hinzugefügt werden, der ein Dogma des Christentums in Frage stellt und der für die internationale zioni-

stische Bewegung charakteristisch ist: die Anklage, die seit zweitausend Jahren auf dem jüdischen Volk lastet und aus ihm in den Augen der ganzen Christenheit ein Volk der Gottesmörder macht. Als die Einberufung des Konzils durch Johannes XXIII. Angekündigt wurde, mußte die internationale zionistische Bewegung darin eine ausgezeichnete Gelegenheit erblicken, diese Anklage offiziell aufheben zu lassen. Und zwar um so mehr, als das Los, welches den Juden während des Zweiten Weltkrieges einzig und allein deswegen zuteil wurde, weil sie Juden waren, in der ganzen Welt allgemeine Empörung ausgelöst hatte, die nicht weniger gerechtfertigt bleiben würde, wenn die Vorkommnisse all der maßlosen Übertreibungen entkleidet und auf ihre wahren Größenverhältnisse zurückgeführt würden, und die durch die nicht weniger allgemeine Sympathie, die dieses Schicksal den Juden einbrachte, in der öffentlichen Meinung eine Atmosphäre schafft, die der Revision dieses Bannfluchurteils günstig ist.

IV. FÜR DEN FRIEDEN

Dies sind die verschiedenen Aspekte der „Operation *Stellvertreter*“, und in dieser Weise sind sie politisch miteinander verknüpft.

Fassen wir sie noch einmal zusammen: die Sorge der protestantischen Kirche um eine Rückeroberung ihrer Positionen gegenüber der katholischen Kirche; die politische Vorherrschaft, die sie in Deutschland eingebüßt hat; die panslawistischen Ambitionen des Bolschewismus; die Liebe auf den ersten Blick der christlichen Progressisten für den Marxismus bolschewistischen Gepräges; schließlich das Interesse der internationalen zionistischen Bewegung an den von Deutschland geforderten Kriegsentschädigungen sowie ihre Sorge um eine Aufhebung der Anklage wegen *Gottesmordes* oder, genauer gesagt, des *Mordes an Christus*, die auf dem jüdischen Volk lastete.

Alles dies aufgepfropft auf die deutsche Frage, so wie sie sich durch den Ausgang des Zweiten Weltkrieges stellte, das heißt auf die einseitige Verantwortlichkeit Deutschlands an der Entfesselung dieses Krieges. Nachdem es nicht geglückt war, in Nürnberg den

rechtlichen Nachweis für diese einseitige Verantwortlichkeit zu erbringen, gedenkt man ihn jetzt nur noch vor der öffentlichen Meinung, mit Hilfe von spektakulären Prozessen und skandalösen Pamphleten, zu erbringen, und zwar durch die Verbrechen, die man die Deutschen beschuldigt, *während* des Krieges, das heißt *nach* seiner Entfesselung, begangen zu haben. Mit gleicher Methode könnte man ebensogut beweisen, daß die Engländer, die Franzosen oder die Russen — oder alle zusammen und unter einer Decke — für diesen Krieg allein verantwortlich seien: Man brauchte nur Auschwitz durch Dresden, Leipzig und fünfzig andere deutsche Städte, nicht zu vergessen Hiroshima und Nagasaki, oder durch Katyn usw. zu ersetzen, und die Sache wäre gemacht. Das Bestürzendste an dieser völlig neuen Art der Beweisführung ist, daß sie von bedeutenden Professoren unternommen wird, die ebenso reichlich mit Diplomen versehen wie hochdekoriert sind und deren Verdienste man tagtäglich feierlich herausstellt, wobei man uns auffordert, uns ehrerbietig vor ihrer Wissenschaft zu verneigen. Eine Tatsache, die es einem für immer verleiden kann, Gelehrter zu werden!

Wir werden nicht weiter bei der Nichtigkeit jener These verweilen, nach der bei Ausbruch eines Krieges die Verantwortung dafür nur einem einzigen Volk oder den Führern eines einzigen Volkes zukommen kann. Dies hatte Pius XII. vollkommen begriffen, und dieser These versuchte er in den Handlungen Geltung zu verschaffen, die man ihm vor allem zum Vorwurf macht.

Am Ende dieser Studie bleibt nur noch eine Alternative: Entweder man gibt zu, daß die Völker stets ohne Urteilsvermögen handeln und daher an den von ihren Führern getroffenen Entscheidungen stets unschuldig sind — übrigens nicht nur hinsichtlich Krieg und Frieden²⁹³ —, daß bei Ausbruch eines Krieges ihre Führer, und zwar alle, ohne Ausnahme, auf beiden Fronten, allein verantwortlich sind und daß infolgedessen der Prozeß nicht mehr zwischen den Siegermächten und dem besiegten Volk stattfindet, sondern zwischen der Gemeinschaft der Völker, in der Sieger und

²⁹³ Hierzu sollte man auch das Werk *Psychologie des foules* von Bouglé heranziehen.

Besiegte miteinander ausgesöhnt sind, und der Gemeinschaft ihrer Führer. Oder, zweite Möglichkeit, man bleibt beim alten Schlendrian, verzichtet darauf, aus diesem Teufelskreis, diesem Circulus vitiosus des Krieges, der nur wiederum Krieg hervorbringt, herauszukommen, und muß dann sogleich, unverzüglich, das jüdische Volk erneut verurteilen, zumindest für den Mord an Christus.

Bei den ersten der beiden Möglichkeiten wird das Problem rasch gelöst sein: Die Völker sind großmütig, tragen nicht nach, Verzeihen ist ihre natürliche Geisteshaltung. „Sie werden Generalamnestie beschließen und die streitenden Parteien abweisen, ohne einer von ihnen recht zu geben und ohne daß es überhaupt nötig ist, zu prozessieren. Die Parteien mögen gemeinsam darangehen, die Schäden zu reparieren und endlich einmal mit diesem immer wiederkehrenden Völkermord, der ständig über unseren Häuptern schwebt, ein Ende machen.“ Es ist offensichtlich sehr zweifelhaft, daß die Führer der Völker diese Sprache freiwillig anhören, und das ist die schwache Stelle dieser vernünftigen Überlegungen. In den herkömmlichen Strukturen nämlich, an denen die Führer der Völker aus Egoismus so sehr festhalten, verfügen sie noch über genügend Kräfte, geheime oder andere, um derartige Überlegungen zum Scheitern zu bringen. Doch früher oder später wird der Geist über das Schwert siegen. Die erschreckenden Fortschritte der Atomwissenschaft beweisen durch die Reaktionen, die sie hervorgerufen, bereits, daß dieser Zeitpunkt nicht mehr fern ist. Nur noch ein winziges Nachhelfen, und es wird geschafft sein. Nicht zweifelhaft und äußerst tröstlich ist dagegen, daß die Völker diese Sprache sprechen. Man braucht nur zu sehen, welcher Gunst sich in der französischen öffentlichen Meinung die Kampagnen für die Amnestie sämtlicher als Verbrechen angerechneten Handlungen derjenigen erfreuen, die zugunsten des FLN (*Front de Libération Nationale*) oder der OAS (*Organisation de l'Armée Secrète*) in den Algerienkrieg verwickelt wurden, wo doch dieser Krieg noch kaum zu Ende gegangen ist. Diese Tendenz ist so stark, daß die Regierung, obwohl sie dies nicht im geringsten beabsichtigt, gezwungen ist, der öffentlichen Meinung nachzugeben. An dem Tage, an dem jemand aufsteht und ganz laut sagt, was alle Leute insgeheim denken, und von einer europäischen Amnestie für alle Handlungen

spricht, die sich auf einen jetzt schon 25 Jahre zurückliegenden Krieg beziehen, einer Amnestie, die für den Krieg selbst, einschließlich derer gilt, die für ihn verantwortlich sind, werden alle Völker so reagieren wie das französische Volk angesichts der Folgen eines Krieges, der gerade erst zu Ende ging. Die Straße der Hoffnung wird alsdann erneut für den wahren Frieden offenstehen.

Bei der zweiten der beiden Möglichkeiten gibt es nur noch das Gesetz der Vergeltung des Alten Testaments, das die Zähne der Kinder stumpf macht bis ins 77. Glied, um sie dafür zu strafen, daß die Väter unreife Trauben gegessen haben: ein Gesetz, das auf der allerniedrigsten, bis ins Äußerste getriebenen Rachsucht beruht und das, auch wenn es im Arsenal der Argumente der hebräischen Theologie und Gerichtsbarkeit sorgsamst bewahrt und verehrt wird, nichtsdestoweniger aus den Uranfängen der Menschheit stammt und im 20. Jahrhundert nur noch eine grobe Beleidigung gegenüber den erhabensten Grundsätzen einer Zivilisation darstellt, die, wenn sie auch praktisch ihre Ziele noch nicht erreicht hat, doch zumindest das Verdienst besitzt, daß sie theoretisch die Menschenwürde zu ihrem wichtigsten Anliegen erhoben hat. Dieses Gesetz der Vergeltung führt die Menschheit von einer Schande zur anderen: von derjenigen, die — nachdem sie alle Menschen ohne Ausnahme unwiderruflich dazu verurteilt hatte, Verbrecher zu sein, indem sie jenes große *Kollektivverbrechen*, den Krieg, zuerst mit großem Getöse forderte und dann rechtfertigte — darin bestand, das Kriegsverbrechen *des einzelnen* zu erfinden, zu derjenigen, die 20 Jahre später seine Nichtverjährbarkeit erfand, und vom Auschwitz-Prozeß zum *Stellvertreter*. All das, um letzten Endes aus dem systematischen Deutschenhaß das fundamentale Gesetz der europäischen Politik zu machen und einen zusätzlichen Kriegsherd im Vorderen Orient zu schaffen.

Die Diskussion zwischen den Anhängern der beiden Möglichkeiten geht weiter. Da das Eigentümliche des Hasses und der Rachsucht aber darin besteht, niemals die Waffen niederzulegen²⁹⁴, hat es nicht den Anschein, daß sie ihrem Ende zugeht: Die Polemik um den *Stellvertreter* dürfte geeignet sein zu beweisen, daß die Heuchler und Exzentriker, die diese beiden Ansichten vertreten, sich auf dem absteigenden Ast befinden, doch . . .

Aber wenn auch die Wahrheit und der gesunde Menschenverstand sich nach und nach durchsetzen und wenn auch theoretisch die Masse jener böartigen Heuchler und Exzentriker sich merklich verringert hat, so sind ihre Anführer nichtsdestoweniger sehr machtvoll organisiert. Praktisch sitzen sie immer noch oben und halten die Geschicke der Welt in Händen. Sollte es ihnen gelingen, die Situation zu ihren Gunsten wiederherzustellen oder sollte jener Umschwung der öffentlichen Meinung, dessen erste Anzeichen bereits zu erkennen waren, zu lange auf sich warten lassen, so wäre das der Triumph des panslawistischen Bolschewismus, das heißt durch die Vernichtung Deutschlands das Ende jenes Europas, das trotz all dem, was Abstimmung und andere, nicht weniger verfälschte Meinungsforschungen bezeugen, im Traum und im Wachen in den Herzen aller Europäer ruht.

Der Leser wird mir beipflichten, daß dieser Blick in die Zukunft es wohl wert war, diese Warnung auszusprechen.

Um so mehr als hinterher . . . Doch es ist besser, nicht daran zu denken, was hinterher kommen würde.

²⁹⁴ In Rom sind sie so weit, Bomben unter die Fenster des Papstes zu legen, und keiner jener guten Apostel, die sich über die Stinkbomben im *Athénée* in Paris entrüsteten — übrigens mit vollem Recht —, hat dagegen protestiert. Zweifellos deswegen nicht, weil Bomben die Frage besser beantworten als Stinkbomben!?

Nachwort

Kaum war der Schlußpunkt unter diese Studie gesetzt, als, wie aus der Büchse der Pandora, ein neuer Ankläger, noch bedrohlicher und noch kategorischer als alle seine Vorgänger, sich im Anklagestand erhob: „Ja, der Papst wußte“, erklärte er in einem Ton, der keine Widerrede duldete, „er wußte und er schwieg.“

Es handelt sich diesmal um den „angesehensten italienischen Journalisten für religiöse Angelegenheiten“. Sein Name: Carlo Falconi. Das heißt für eine beachtliche Anzahl von Gutgläubigen sehr wahrscheinlich, daß dieses Ansehen immerhin ein recht gut gehütetes Geheimnis war²⁹⁵. Sein Manager: *Candide*, eine Zeitschrift, die bis jetzt eher zur entgegengesetzten These hingeneigt hatte. Ziemlich überraschend also. Aber ist eine Zeitschrift, die sich niemals ändert, nicht absurd?

Kurz: In leuchtenden Schlagzeilen, über die ganze Titelseite und mit dem Foto Pius' XII. bringt *Candide*²⁹⁶, die die bezeichnendsten Auszüge der demnächst erscheinenden Abhandlung²⁹⁷ des neuen Anklägers veröffentlicht, in einem grellen Rot ihre kategorische Erklärung mit diesem Keulenschlag: „Das Dokument, das alles enthüllt“. Dieser Schlag wird durch einen weiteren Zwischentitel der Auszüge verdoppelt, aus dessen Formulierung zur Genüge hervorgeht, daß er als Gnadenstoß gemeint ist: „Das entscheidende Dokument über den Vatikan und die Nazi-Lager.“

Man kann den Wert eines Buches nicht nach Auszügen allein beurteilen. Zumindest aber darf man darin die Punkte erwarten, die an dem Buch für den eventuellen Leser am bedeutsamsten und verlockendsten sind. Im vorliegenden Fall jenes „entscheidende Dokument, das alles enthüllt“. Man liest also und erfährt, daß der Verfasser „in den Archiven des Heiligen Stuhls“ den Beweis entdeckte, daß „Ja, der Papst wußte“. Doch von einem Dokument erfährt man nichts: Das Dokument ist vielmehr — halten wir uns gut fest — die Abhandlung des Anklägers selbst!

Wirklich ein bewundernswertes Verfahren!

²⁹⁵ Er ist in Wirklichkeit ein ehemaliger Priester.

²⁹⁶ 31. Mai 1965

²⁹⁷ Bei Éd. du Rocher

Dagegen findet man in diesen Buchauszügen zwei neue Zeugen mit ihrem Foto: Admiral Canaris, den ehemaligen Chef der Abwehr im Dritten Reich, und von Papen, den früheren Botschafter Hitlers in Ankara, wo er engste Beziehungen zu Msgr. Roncalli (dem verstorbenen Johannes XXIII.) unterhielt, der dort Nuntius Pius' XII. war.

Das hier angewandte Verfahren ist nicht weniger bemerkenswert. Unter dem Bild des ersten findet sich folgende Erläuterung: „Canaris, Chef des nationalsozialistischen Geheimdienstes, *soll* den Vatikan über die nationalsozialistischen Grausamkeiten informiert *haben*.“ Die übliche hypothetische Ausdrucksweise aller Ankläger Pius' XII. Man sucht im Text nach einer Rechtfertigung dafür: Die Formulierung ist darin wohl wieder aufgegriffen, doch ein Beleg wird nicht gegeben. Eine schlichte Unterstellung also.

Der Text unter dem Foto von Papens hat die Form einer positiven Aussage: „Der Botschafter Hitlers *hatte* dem Delegaten des Vatikans, Msgr. Roncalli, Indiskretionen *übermittelt*.“ Sieht man sich den Text genauer an, so erfährt man, daß dies nur „aller Wahrscheinlichkeit nach“ geschah, aber erhält nicht den geringsten Hinweis auf diese „Indiskretionen“.

Im Falle Papens sind wir durch seine Aussagen in Nürnberg glücklicherweise darüber informiert, was er Msgr. Roncalli hat übermitteln können:

„... unsere allgemeine Kenntnis war die, daß die Juden in Lager nach Polen abtransportiert werden; aber von einer vorsätzlichen Extermination ... ist uns nichts bekannt gewesen²⁹⁸ ... Ich glaube, sie sollten deportiert werden, Mylord, nach Polen. Aber daß sie vernichtet werden sollten, das haben wir 1944 nicht gewußt ... Zum Zwecke der Vernichtung — ich glaube, daß uns das damals nicht gesagt worden seit²⁹⁹.“

Und er hatte am vorhergehenden 19. September im Ermittlungsverfahren deutlich gemacht, daß er erst „hier [in Nürnberg] von all den Verbrechen erfahren³⁰⁰ hätte“.

²⁹⁸ *Prozeß gegen die Hauptkriegsverbrecher*, Sitzungstag 19. Juni 1946 (Nürnberg 1948), XVI, S. 465

²⁹⁹ Ebd., S. 466

³⁰⁰ Ebd., Sitzungstag 18. Juni 1946 (Nürnberg 1948), XVI, S. 372

Er hat also Msgr. Roncalli nicht mehr sagen können. Doch der Leser weiß durch die in dieser Studie angeführten Texte Pius' XII. (insbesondere seine üblichen Ansprachen vom 2. Juni jeden Jahres, einschließlich derjenigen vom 2. Juni 1945 und seines Schreibens an Kardinal von Preysing), daß alles dies, und außerdem weitaus genauer, schon lange vor 1944 (seit 1939 für Polen, 1941 für die Slowakei, 1942 für Holland usw.) im Vatikan bekannt war. Das Schreiben Kardinal Tisserants bezeugt andererseits, daß man darüber hinaus dort nichts gewußt hat, vor allem nicht über Auschwitz, sondern „erst nach der Ankunft der Alliierten in Deutschland³⁰¹“ davon erfahren habe, d. h. frühestens Ende 1944 oder Anfang 1945.

Nach den Auszügen beurteilt, trägt also die Abhandlung des Journalisten Carlo Falconi keine neuen Gesichtspunkte in die Debatte — außer einem: Seine Vorgänger im Anklagestand beschränkten sich darauf, Fakten zu verschweigen oder sie tendenziös auszulegen, er hingegen geniert sich nicht, sogar welche zu erfinden. Seine Darstellungen erfolgen in der Form einer ungesicherten Annahme, die Schlußfolgerungen im Indikativ der positiven Aussage: Nur darin liegt seine Originalität.

Was die von Carlo Falconi angeführten realen Fakten betrifft, war es keineswegs notwendig, sie in den Archiven des Heiligen Stuhls zu ermitteln: Man fand sie bereits in der Presse, und daher kannte jedermann sie schon lange, bevor er sie uns enthüllte. Mit einem Wort, es waren offene Geheimnisse. Niemand hat überdies jemals behauptet, Pius XII. habe die Fakten nicht gekannt. Bemerkenswert ist hierbei, daß unser Verfasser, der immerhin ehrlich genug war, zuzugeben (was seine Vorgänger nicht oft taten), daß sie ohne Ausnahme diplomatische Proteste des Vatikans ausgelöst haben, in einem sensationellen Titel trotzdem daraus folgte: „Die wahren Gründe für das Schweigen Pius' XII.³⁰²“.

Bei der anschließenden Darlegung dieser „wahren Gründe“ unterrichtet uns Carlo Falconi, damit niemand seine Absichten mißverstehen möge, gleich zu Beginn davon, daß „Pius XII. außer-

³⁰¹ Vgl. oben S. 44 Trotzdem benutzt Carlo Falconi den Kardinal, um zu beweisen, daß der Papst „wußte“.

³⁰² *Candide* v. 7. Juni 1965

gewöhnlichen Mut besaß“, zugleich aber, daß er „seiner Veranlagung nach ängstlich und zurückhaltend“ war, und schließlich, daß er „niemals gewagt hat“.

Nachdem er diese von einer so seltsamen Logik zeugende Vorstellung zum Prinzip erhoben hat, fügt er noch hinzu, daß „die im *Stellvertreter* vorgebrachten Motive nicht der Wirklichkeit entsprechen“. Doch hören wir, welche er selbst gefunden hat:

„die Sorge Pius' XII., der Kirche in ganz Europa die Möglichkeit ihres Fortbestehens zu sichern, und zwar mit ausreichenden Kräften, um in der Nachkriegszeit die Zukunft des Kontinents und der ganzen Welt in entscheidender Weise zu beeinflussen“;

„seine Überzeugung, daß die Schwächung des Nationalsozialismus dem Kommunismus nützlich wäre, insbesondere wenn man das blinde Vertrauen berücksichtigt, das die Staatsmänner der Alliierten in die kommunistischen Führer setzten“;

„seine Deutschfreundlichkeit [über die, wie er sagt,] man viel und in sehr überzeugender Weise geschrieben hat“.

Daraus sieht man kaum, was diese Abhandlung von denjenigen der Herren Hochhuth, Friedländer, Nobécourt und Genossen unterscheidet, deren Hauptanklagepunkte ganz genau die gleichen sind, nur anders formuliert.

Es soll daher über Carlo Falconi nur noch eine einzige Bemerkung gemacht werden, eine Bemerkung, die für alle, die ihm auf diesem Weg vorangingen, wie für alle, die ihm darauf folgen werden — und es werden zweifellos noch welche kommen —, gilt:

Wenn derartige, immer gleiche Anklagen, die durch derartige ebenfalls immer gleiche Verfahren gestützt werden, weiterhin in Umlauf gesetzt werden können und die Aufmerksamkeit der Öffentlichkeit zu fesseln vermögen, dann einzig und allein deshalb, weil die Verteidiger Pius' XII. nicht den Mut gehabt haben, die Debatte über die untergeordnete Frage, was er wußte oder nicht wußte, hinauszuführen, und weil sie zugelassen haben, daß

ihre Gegner gerade diese Frage zum „Schlüssel des Problems“ (so Carlo Falconi) seines Verhaltens machten. Doch bekanntlich liegt der Schlüssel des Problems nicht dort, sondern in seiner Theorie vom Frieden bzw. von der Wiederherstellung des Friedens, wenn der Krieg ausgebrochen ist, einer Theorie, die übrigens in glänzendster und angemessenster Weise in einem soeben erschienen Buch³⁰³ dargelegt ist, das einige von denen, die die Verteidigung Pius' XII. übernommen haben, so leichtfertig sie sich bisher auch gezeigt haben mögen, vielleicht nicht ohne Gewinn lesen würden.

Den 9. Juni 1965

³⁰³ G. Herberichs, *Théorie de la Paix selon Pie XII*

Anhang I

Allgemeine Auffassungen über Pius XII. bis zu Rolf Hochhuth

I. *Le Populaire* (3. 3. 1939)

„Schlappe für Mussolini“
„Kardinal Pacelli, dessen Exklusion
Graf Ciano verlangt hatte, ist
bereits am ersten Tag des Konklaves
gewählt worden.“

„Um die Kontinuität seiner Politik
des Friedens und des Widerstandes
gegen den Rassenwahn zu unter-
streichen, nimmt er den Namen
Pius XII. an.“

Unter diesem Titel und diesen beiden Untertiteln, die eine festgefügte Meinung und eine unverhohlene Befriedigung zum Ausdruck bringen, konnte man in *Le Populaire* vom 3. März 1939 auf der Titelseite einen dreispaltigen Artikel von Pierre Brossolette lesen, in dem dieser sich glücklich schätzt, daß das Konklave in dem Augenblick, in dem der Frieden so schwer gefährdet war, durch die Wahl Kardinal Pacellis, des künftigen Pius' XII., „zur Wahrung des Friedens einen nahezu unbezahlbaren Beitrag geleistet“ habe:

„Wenn das einzige Drama, das sich in diesem Augenblick abspielt, nicht das des Friedens wäre, hätten wir der Papstwahl gleichgültig zusehen können. Wir wissen, daß die Kirche, ob freiheitlich oder autoritär, stets die Kirche ist, daß ihr Glaube sie zu der Freiheit des Geistes in Gegensatz bringt, daß die Fälle, in denen die Glaubenspraxis sie nicht zur Freiheit der Menschen in Gegensatz gebracht hat, selten sind. Wer weiß, ob nicht morgen der Sozialismus diese Erfahrung machen wird, wie sie die Republik so lange und so bitter gemacht hat?

LEON BLUM

Administrateur-Directeur

EUGENE GAILLARD

LE PO.

VENREDI
2 MARS 1943

ORGANE CENTRAL

ECHEC A MUSSOLINI!

*Le cardinal Pacelli contre
lequel le comte Ciano avait
lancé l'exclusive a été élu dès la
première journée du Conclave*

POUR MARQUER
LA CONTINUITE
DE SA POLITIQUE
DE PAIX
ET DE RESISTANCE
AU RACISME
IL PREND LE NOM
DE PIE XII



PIU' DI 1000000 DI SOLDATI
E DI 1000000 DI NAUVEAU
E DI 1000000 DI NAUVEAU
E DI 1000000 DI NAUVEAU

Doch die Ernennung des Nachfolgers Pius' XI. reihte sich nicht in diesen Streit ein. „Pace! Pace!“ hatte der verstorbene Papst sterbend gemurmelt. Das war kein frommer und nichtiger Wunsch. Die schwere Bedrohung, die die Diktaturen für die Welt bedeuteten, hatte seine letzten Jahre mit Angst und Unruhe erfüllt. Zweifellos hatten die Übergriffe der totalitären Staaten gegenüber den geistigen und materiellen Interessen der Kirche bei ihm diese klare Erkenntnis der Gefahr beschleunigt, doch was hat das zu sagen? Was bleibt, ist die Tatsache, daß er, als er noch kaum die Gefahr geahnt hatte, auch schon von seiner leidenschaftlichen Frömmigkeit dazu getrieben wurde, sich mit seiner ganzen Persönlichkeit dagegen zu wenden, und daß im Verlauf dieser letzten Monate die Beharrlichkeit, mit der das Papsttum handelte, ebenso wie seine feierliche Verdammung des Fanatismus und der Gewalt zur Wahrung des Friedens einen nahezu unschätzbaren Beitrag geleistet haben.“

Pierre Brossolette hatte große Angst gehabt:

„Doch würde sich die Kirche den Scharfblick ihres letzten Hirten zu eigen machen? Würde sie unter den möglichen Nachfolgern Pius' XI. denjenigen erwählen, der die größte Eignung zu besitzen schien, seine Politik fortzusetzen, nachdem er zuvor das tatkräftigste und erlauchtste Werkzeug dieser Politik gewesen war? Genügten nicht die Intrigen, die Art der Behandlung, der Druck, den die faschistische Regierung auf ein überwiegend aus Italienern bestehendes Kardinalskollegium ausübte, eine gewissermaßen plebiszitäre Entscheidung zugunsten der festen Haltung, die Pius XI. eingenommen hatte, an der Person Kardinal Pacellis zu verhindern? Die ganze Einstellung des Konklaves mußte sich in der Antwort auf diese Fragen zeigen.

Man weiß indessen, daß Kardinal Pacelli sich gerade dadurch, daß er Staatssekretär des verstorbenen Papstes war, in einer schlechten Position befand. Die Kirche liebt keine Dynastien. Ein tiefwurzelndes Vorurteil hält sie für gewöhnlich davon ab, den engsten Mitarbeiter eines Papstes zu dessen Nachfolger zu machen. Seit der Wahl Leos XIII. war es weder Kardinal Rampolla noch Kardinal Merry del Val noch Kardinal Gasparri gelungen, dieses Hindernis zu überwinden. Der Staatssekretär Pius' XI. ist erfolgreicher gewe-

sen: Angesichts der Notwendigkeit, durch eine aufsehererregende Geste die Kontinuität einer Politik zu bekräftigen, die sich weder dazu versteht, der Gewalt das Recht einzuräumen, den Frieden zu stören, noch das, ihn zu diktieren, ist man zu seinen Gunsten von dieser Tradition abgewichen.“

Trotz dieser Gründe, die gegen Kardinal Pacelli sprachen, „dessen leidenschaftliche Frömmigkeit ihn dazu getrieben hatte, sich gegen die Gefahr, die durch die totalitären Regime repräsentiert wird, zu erheben“, trotz „der Intrigen und des Druckes“ war die Antwort des Konklaves . . .

„ . . . aufsehererregend. Trotz des durch den *Telegrafo* eingelegten Vetos (oder vielleicht gerade wegen dieses Vetos), trotz der in den faschistischen Kreisen betriebenen beharrlichen Kampagne gegen die Wahl eines ‚politischen‘ Papstes ist Kardinal Pacelli auf den Thron Petri gewählt worden. Die Wahl wurde nach Beratungen, die weniger als einen Tag dauerten, bei nur drei Wahlgängen erreicht — ein in den Annalen der Kirche fast einmaliges Ereignis.

Etwas betreten über diesen Mißerfolg gaben die faschistischen Kreise bereits gestern abend zu verstehen, daß sie letzten Endes gegenüber Kardinal Pacelli eine wohlwollende Neutralität gewahrt hätten, und man brauchte sie nicht sehr zu drängen, um sie zu der Aussage zu veranlassen, daß sie sehr auf den neuen Papst rechneten, da es ja schließlich leichter sei, sich mit einem ‚Politiker‘ als mit einem ‚Heiligen‘ zu verständigen. Es ist nicht unsere Aufgabe, sie eines Besseren zu belehren, obgleich wir davon überzeugt sind, daß, wenn auch das Handeln der ‚Politiker‘ zuweilen weniger eindrucksvoll ist als das der ‚Heiligen‘, das erstere dem letzteren gegenüber doch zumindest den Vorteil besitzt, sich nützlicher — weil früher — auszuwirken. Es ist für uns nicht notwendig, daß man die Diktaturen an dem Tag, an dem sie den Krieg erklären, blitzartig niederschmettert. Was wir hingegen dringend fordern, ist, daß man uns hilft, sie daran zu hindern, den Krieg zu entfesseln.

Nun ist man aber in der ganzen Welt der Überzeugung, daß der Nachfolger Pius' XI. mit ebenso brennendem Eifer dazu beitragen wird wie Pius XI. selbst. Der neue Papst hat diese Überzeugung im übrigen dadurch bestärkt, daß er den gleichen Namen wie sein Vorgänger wählte.

Möge Mussolini dies doch nur verstehen! Möge Hitler dies doch auch verstehen! Möchten sie doch verstehen, daß die katholische Welt sich in der Person ihres neuen Oberhauptes wie in der ihrer Kardinäle soeben unwiderruflich gegen die Diktaturen und gegen die Politik der Drohung, der Gewalt und des Krieges ausgesprochen hat. Und möchten sie dieser Politik doch rechtzeitig Einhalt gebieten und daran denken, daß niemand auf der Welt, und hieße er selbst Hitler oder Mussolini, eine Partie gewinnen kann, in der er die Völker und den Papst zugleich gegen sich hat!“

Pierre Brossolette
(*Le Populaire*, 3. März 1939, S. 1)

II. *L'Humanité* (3. 3. 1939)

„Rasche Wahl Kardinal Pacellis —
Pius XII. Nachfolger Pius' XI.“

„Die anmaßende Exklusionsforderung,
die durch die faschistischen
Regierungen von Berlin und Rom
gegen ihn erhoben wurde, hat ihre
Antwort erhalten.“

Dieser dreispaltige Titel und der Untertitel auf der ersten Seite von *L'Humanité* vom 3. März 1939 sind nicht weniger bezeichnend und zeugen von nicht weniger großer Befriedigung als die des *Populaire* vom gleichen Tag. Der Verfasser des Artikels, Pierre-Laurent Darnar, ist noch entschiedener als Pierre Brossolette. Er zeigt uns in der Person des Kardinals Pacelli und nunmehrigen Pius' XII. „einen Papst, der ein Gegner des Rassenstandpunktes und ein Freund der Gewissensfreiheit ist und der die Menschenwürde achtet.

Beabsichtigt er nicht, mit der Wahl des Namens die Politik desjenigen fortzusetzen, dessen engster Mitarbeiter und Staatssekretär er in all den letzten Jahren war?

Denn man konnte Kardinal Pacelli und den Papst nicht trennen, wenn es darum ging, die Unsinnigkeit des Rassenstandpunktes, die

Rapide élection du cardinal Pacelli

— Pie XII —
comme successeur de Pie XI



L'INSOLENTE EXCLUSIVE
LANCÉE CONTRE LUI PAR
LES GOUVERNEMENTS
FASCISTES DE BERLIN ET
DE ROME A REÇU SA
RÉPONSE

Chambre a discuté

W HAT JOUR après la mort de Pie XI, son successeur élu à la tête du Vatican.

... C'est le cardinal Pacelli, qui succède à son prédécesseur, élu à la tête du Vatican.

... C'est le cardinal Pacelli, qui succède à son prédécesseur, élu à la tête du Vatican.

... C'est le cardinal Pacelli, qui succède à son prédécesseur, élu à la tête du Vatican.

... C'est le cardinal Pacelli, qui succède à son prédécesseur, élu à la tête du Vatican.

... C'est le cardinal Pacelli, qui succède à son prédécesseur, élu à la tête du Vatican.

... C'est le cardinal Pacelli, qui succède à son prédécesseur, élu à la tête du Vatican.

Les gouvernements fascistes
berlinois et romains ont
répondu à la Chambre.

Verfolgungen im Dritten Reich, die Anschläge des Faschismus gegen die Gewissensfreiheit und die Menschenwürde zu verurteilen.

Der frühere Staatssekretär — und jetzige Papst —, der von der sozialistischen Volksfrontregierung im Jahre 1937 mit großen Ehren empfangen wurde, neigt zur Verständigung mit den Demokratien für die gemeinsame Verteidigung der höchsten Güter der freien Menschen, die bedroht oder verfolgt sind.

Wie hätten die französischen Kommunisten, deren Führer Maurice Thorez seine offene Hand darbot, die von April 1936 an das Symbol einer Politik des Zusammenschlusses wurde, nicht eine Mithilfe schätzen sollen, die nach den ehrerbietigen Worten Präsident Herriots der Sache des Friedens und der Freiheit gewidmet sei?

Die Tatsache, daß die Wahl bereits am ersten Tag des Konklaves erfolgte und die Entscheidung sogleich auf Kardinal Pacelli fiel, gewinnt noch größere Bedeutung, wenn man weiß, welche unverschämten Exklusionsforderungen Hitler und Mussolini gegen seine Person und gegen das, was diese für sie bedeutete, erhoben.

Als einen ‚zu großen Freund Frankreichs‘ bezeichnete ihn voller Haß der *Telegrafo* des Grafen Ciano zwei Tage nach dem Tode Pius’ XI. . . .“

Die faschistischen Regierungen standen der Wahl Kardinal Pacellis nicht weniger feindlich gegenüber als der letztere ihnen:

„ . . . Die faschistischen Regierungen hätten gerne mit der politischen Linie des Vatikans kurzen Prozeß gemacht, das Papsttum in ihre Gewalt gebracht und es ihren Anordnungen unterworfen. Da aber eine ihnen völlig hörige Kreatur fehlte, hatten sie gehofft, zumindest einen schwachen, furchtsamen und gefügigen Menschen auf den päpstlichen Stuhl zu bringen.

Sie haben ihre Antwort erhalten.

Sie stellt eine um so schärfere Entgegnung dar, als die Kardinäle in der Mehrheit Italiener sind und ein großer Teil von ihnen sofort für den von Mussolini abgelehnten Papst gestimmt haben muß.

Schon lassen Berlin und Rom ihre Wut durchblicken. Ganz sicher werden Beleidigungen auf diesen ‚Juden und Marxisten‘ herabregnen! Als ob ein heimliches Einverständnis zwischen Doktrinen vor-

läge, wenn sich lediglich die Menschen zu ihrem Schutz zusammenschließen und wenn die Gewissensfreiheit ganz einfach bei der Freiheit Zuflucht sucht.

Doch für die Gestapo war bereits Pius XI. ‚der Papst Moskaus‘! Die Wahl Pius’ XII. wird zweifellos ‚eine bolschewistische Machenschaft‘ sein!

Bedauernswerte Leute! Das Ereignis ist weit tiefgründiger und bedeutsamer!“

P.-L. Darnar
(*L’Humanité*, 3. März 1939, S. 1)

Wie wenn der Artikel P.-L. Darnars nicht schon genügend für sich spräche, ging Gabriel Péri auf der dritten Seite derselben Nummer von *L’Humanité* unter der Überschrift „Die Reaktion Hitlers“ noch weiter.

„Berlin, 2. März. — Die Wahl Kardinal Pacellis hat in den politischen Kreisen Deutschlands sehr große Erregung ausgelöst. Es wird die Ansicht vertreten, die Kardinäle ‚hätten durch die Einsetzung eines ›Berufspolitikers‹ in das höchste Amt der katholischen Welt einen ungewöhnlichen Schritt getan‘.

Bekanntlich ist der neue Papst von den Nationalsozialisten stets sehr angegriffen worden.

Tatsächlich spielte er in den ausländischen diplomatischen Kreisen Berlins in der Nachkriegszeit eine sehr bedeutende Rolle. Er war es, der nach der Revolution von 1918 das neue Konkordat zwischen dem Heiligen Stuhl und Deutschland aushandelte und unterzeichnete . . . “

„Den Faschismus oder den Frieden retten . . . “

„ . . . Es steht weiter fest, daß das Konklave soeben den früheren engsten Mitarbeiter Pius’ XI. gewählt hat, und zwar trotz der Ratsschläge von Bergens und der Exklusionsforderungen des *Telegrafo*.“

Gabriel Péri.
(*L’Humanité*, 3. März 1939, S. 3)

Anhang II

Selbstzeugnis Pius' XII.

Schreiben Pius' XII. an den
Berliner Bischof Graf von Preysing

Am 30. April 1943 richtete Pius XII. an den Berliner Bischof von Preysing folgendes Schreiben:

„Zunächst sprechen Wir dir, ehrwürdiger Bruder, innigsten Dank aus für die guten Wünsche, die du persönlich wie im Namen deines Klerus und deiner Diözesanen Uns bei verschiedenen Gelegenheiten, noch im Dezember zu den heiligen Festen um die Jahreswende und zuletzt zum Jahrestag Unserer Wahl zum Obersten Hirten der Kirche, ausgesprochen hast. Wir wissen, aus welch treuem und von Glaubensgeist erfülltem Herzen sie kommen. Wir danken dir und deiner Herde besonders für euer frommes Gebet. In deinem Schreiben vom 27. Februar d. J. versicherst du Uns eurer inständigen Fürbitte aus dem Bewußtsein heraus, „daß wohl selten im Anfang eines Pontifikats einem Papste eine so schwere Last von Gott aufgebürdet worden ist“ wie Uns „durch den furchtbaren Weltkrieg und all das, was er an Schmerzlichem und Sündhaftem im Gefolge hat“. Es ist gewiß immer Vorsicht geboten, wenn man die Gegenwart mit der Vergangenheit vergleichen will, und es liegt Uns fern, die Sorgen und Nöte, die auf die Schultern Unserer Vorgänger gedrückt haben, zu unterschätzen. Aber sicher ist der ehrliche Wille der Päpste, in weittragenden und erschütternden Auseinandersetzungen unter den Mächten dieser Erde allen mit voller Unparteilichkeit zu begegnen, gleichzeitig aber auch die Belange der heiligen Kirche sorgsam zu wahren, selten einer Belastungsprobe ausgesetzt gewesen, wie der Heilige Stuhl sie gegenwärtig zu bestehen hat. Was indes noch mehr bedrückt, ist, wie du richtig sagst, „all das, was der Krieg an Schmerzlichem und Sündhaftem im Gefolge hat“. Die hemmungslos steigende sachliche Grausamkeit der Kriegstechnik macht den Gedanken an eine noch lange Dauer des gegenseitigen Mordens unerträglich; was Uns seit Jahr und Tag an Unmenschlichkeiten zu Ohren kommt, die ganz und gar außer-

halb der ernsthaften Kriegsnotwendigkeiten liegen, wirkt nachgerade lähmend und schaudererregend. Die Flucht in das Gebet zum allwissenden Gott und zu dem Erlöser im Tabernakel gibt allein die sittliche Kraft, dem Eindruck solchen Geschehens seelisch zu widerstehen.“

Die Einstellung des Nationalsozialismus zu den Bemühungen
des Papstes, die Unmenschlichkeit des Krieges zu mildern

„Auch ihr habt die Schrecken des Krieges in der unsagbar schweren Form der Luftangriffe erfahren müssen. Wir sprechen dir und deinen Diözesanen nochmals Unser teilnehmendes tiefes Bedauern zum Einsturz der Hedwigskathedrale infolge des letzten Angriffs auf Berlin aus. Die Gläubigen sollen wissen, daß Wir täglich im besonderen für die beten und denen Unseren Segen spenden, die an diesem Tage auf der einen oder anderen Seite von Luftangriffen heimgesucht werden. Wir tun zur Minderung der Kriegsleiden, was in Unseren Kräften steht, und haben, ohne Uns von der geringen Aussicht auf Erfolg abhalten zu lassen, Uns immer wieder für möglichste Schonung der Zivilbevölkerung eingesetzt. Es ist nicht Unsere Schuld, daß eine nach allen Seiten gleichmäßige Behandlung der Kriegsfragen Uns nötigt, jetzt, wo Deutschland der unter den Luftangriffen am stärksten leidende Teil geworden ist, bei Vermittlungen umsichtig zu Werke zu gehen — ganz abgesehen davon, daß deutsche amtliche Stellen anlässlich der Anwesenheit des Erzbischofs von New York in Rom, oder besser anlässlich der Gerüchte, die um seinen Rombesuch gingen, die Öffentlichkeit haben wissen lassen, Deutschland sei an Bemühungen des Papstes um eine Humanisierung des Krieges nicht interessiert. Unsere Schritte für Menschlichkeit im Kriege gelten in gleicher Sorge allen Kriegsoptionen, allen materiell oder seelisch unter der Kriegsnot Leidenden — und diese hoffen in Deutschland ebenso auf Unsere Hilfe wie in der übrigen Welt.

Auch Unseren Nachrichtendienst für Kriegsgefangene hätten Wir sehr gerne Deutschland ebenso zugute kommen lassen wie anderen Ländern. Der Nachrichtendienst hat sich aus den an den Heiligen Stuhl herantretenden Anfragen und Bitten um Vermittlung, de-

nen vielfach von anderen Stellen gar nicht hätte entsprochen werden können, ganz von selbst zu dem entwickelt, was er jetzt ist. Zusammen mit Unserer übrigen Kriegshilfe hat er — Wir sagen das mit tiefem Dank gegen Gott — viel und umfassend Gutes schaffen können. Es ist Uns unerfindlich, welche sachlichen Gründe die deutschen Behörden veranlaßt haben könnten, dem Päpstlichen Hilfswerk den Eingang nach Deutschland zu sperren. Die deutsche Sperre für Gefangenennachrichten von hier hat sich u. a. fühlbar gemacht, als es sich darum handelte, einige Tausend Meldungen von deutschen Kriegsgefangenen, die Unserem Nachrichtendienst zugegangen waren, an die Angehörigen in Deutschland weiterzuleiten. Es ist schließlich gelungen, aber nur auf Umwegen und mit größten Schwierigkeiten. Seit Herbst 1942 kommen aus Deutschland, und zwar in immer steigender Zahl, Anfragen über Vermißte oder Gefangene, deren letzter Standort an der russischen Front, meistens bei Stalingrad, war. Es spricht eine erschütternde Not aus diesen Anfragen. Von Unserer Seite wird jeder nur mögliche Versuch gemacht, um Mitteilungen über die in Rußland lebenden Kriegsgefangenen zu erhalten, bis jetzt leider ohne Erfolg.“

Die Hirtenbriefe der deutschen Bischöfe

„Wir sind dir, ehrwürdiger Bruder, dankbar für die klaren und offenen Worte, die du bei verschiedenen Gelegenheiten an deine Gläubigen und damit an die Öffentlichkeit gerichtet hast; Wir denken u. a. an deine Ausführungen vom 28. Juni 1942 über die christliche Rechtsauffassung; vom Totensonntag im vergangenen November über das Recht auf Leben und Liebe, das jedem Menschen zusteht; Wir denken besonders an deinen Adventshirtenbrief, der ja auch für die westdeutschen Kirchenprovinzen bestimmt war, über die Herrschaftsrechte Gottes, die Rechte des einzelnen und der Familie.

Man wende nicht ein, daß bischöfliche Kundgebungen, die mutvoll der eigenen Regierung gegenüber für die Rechte der Religion, der Kirche, der menschlichen Persönlichkeit, für Schutzlose, von der öffentlichen Macht Vergewaltigte eintreten, gleichviel ob die Betroffenen Kinder der Kirche oder Außenstehende sind — daß

solche Kundgebungen eurem Vaterland in der Weltöffentlichkeit schaden. Jenes mutvolle Eintreten für Recht und Menschlichkeit stellt euer Vaterland nicht bloß, wird euch und ihm vielmehr in der Weltöffentlichkeit Achtung schaffen und kann sich in Zukunft sehr zu seinem Besten auswirken.

Als Oberster Hirt der Gläubigen sorgen Wir Uns auch darum, daß eure Katholiken ihre Überzeugungen und deren Bekenntnis rein halten von einem Sichabfinden mit Grundsätzen und Taten, die dem Gesetz Gottes und dem Geiste Christi widerstreiten, ja ihnen mehr als einmal hohnsprechen. Es hat Uns, um ein nahelegendes Beispiel zu nehmen, getröstet, zu hören, daß die Katholiken, gerade auch die Berliner Katholiken, den sogenannten Nichtariern in ihrer Bedrängnis viel Liebe entgegengebracht haben, und Wir sagen in diesem Zusammenhang ein besonderes Wort väterlicher Anerkennung wie innigen Mitgefühls dem in Gefangenschaft befindlichen Prälaten Lichtenberg.

Aber schon der Gedanke, es könnten allmählich, vielleicht fast unvermerkt, jene Auffassungen durch die Macht der Gewöhnung und unter der Wirkung ihrer unaufhörlichen Verbreitung Eingang auch in die Gedankenwelt der Katholiken, besonders ihrer jungen Generation, finden, schon dieser Gedanke schmerzt Uns. Du weißt, daß der Heilige Stuhl die Vorgänge bei euch auf liturgischem Gebiet für wichtig genug gehalten hat, um sich mit ihnen zu befassen. Wir gestehen aber, daß Uns die Reinerhaltung der christlichen Überzeugung von aller ihr drohenden Vergiftung noch ungleich mehr am Herzen liegt als jene liturgischen Fragen. Was würde ein noch so schöner Gottesdienst im Kirchenraum bedeuten, wenn draußen im Leben Denken und Tun der Gläubigen dem Gesetz und der Liebe Christi entfremdet wären!“

Die Gründe für die Zurückhaltung des Papstes

„Den an Ort und Stelle tätigen Oberhirten überlassen Wir es, abzuwägen, ob und bis zu welchem Grade die Gefahr von Vergeltungsmaßnahmen und Druckmitteln im Falle bischöflicher Kundgebungen sowie andere vielleicht durch die Länge und Psychologie des Krieges verursachten Umstände es ratsam erschei-

nen lassen, trotz der angeführten Beweggründe, ad maiora mala vitanda Zurückhaltung zu üben. Hier liegt einer der Gründe, warum Wir selber Uns in Unseren Kundgebungen Beschränkung auferlegen; die Erfahrung, die Wir im Jahre 1942 mit päpstlichen, von Uns aus für die Weitergabe an die Gläubigen freigestellten Schriftstücken gemacht haben, rechtfertigt, soweit Wir sehen, Unsere Haltung.

Wir haben diese Fragen ausführlicher mit dir besprochen, nicht als ob du Unserer Ermunterung zum Handeln bedürftest, sondern, im Gegenteil, weil Wir einerseits dein starkes Empfinden für die Ehre der heiligen Kirche und deinen Mut kennen, andererseits wissen, daß du die Gesamtlage mit umsichtiger Nüchternheit beurteilst. Für den Stellvertreter Christi wird der Pfad, den er gehen muß, um zwischen den sich widerstreitenden Forderungen seines Hirtenamtes den richtigen Ausgleich zu finden, immer verschlungener und dornenvoller.

Wir haben die gegen die Kirche gerichteten Maßnahmen vor Augen, von denen deine Schreiben Uns Mitteilung machten: Einziehung von Kirchengut, Wegnahme deines Bischöflichen Seminars Hedwigshöhe, Einschränkung oder Unterbindung der Seelsorge an den nach Deutschland verbrachten Polen, auch des Religionsunterrichtes für polnische Kinder, Eheverbot für die Polen usw., alles immer wieder nur Teilstücke aus dem größeren Rahmen und umfassenderen Plan einer Drosselung der kirchlichen Lebenskraft im deutschen Machtraum. Am härtesten getroffen ist, wie du weißt, die katholische Kirche im Warthegau. Wir leiden schwer unter der namenlosen Not der Gläubigen dortselbst, um so mehr, als jeder Versuch, für sie bei den Regierungsstellen zu vermitteln, auf schroffste Ablehnung gestoßen ist. Die Rücksichtnahmen, von denen weiter oben die Rede war, im Sonderfall des Warthegaues vor allem die Befürchtung, den Rest von Seelsorge, der dort noch besteht, auch zu gefährden, haben Uns bis jetzt davon zurückgehalten, die dortigen kirchlichen Zustände offen zur Sprache zu bringen.

Über die Lage und das Schicksal der in Konzentrationslager verbrachten Priester, unter denen die Polen weitaus an erster Stelle stehen, sind Wir verhältnismäßig gut unterrichtet. Wenn

sich irgendwie Gelegenheit bietet, möge man jene Priester wie ihre Mitgefangenen immer wissen lassen, daß ihnen Unser innigstes Mitgefühl gehört, daß in dieser von Leid und Grauen erfüllten Zeit Uns wenige Schicksale so nahegehen wie das ihre und daß Wir viel und täglich für sie beten.

Der Wortlaut der Denkschrift, die der deutsche Episkopat an die höchsten Stellen des Reiches gelangen ließ, liegt Uns vor. Nun wißt ihr ja selbst, wie geringe Aussicht auf Erfolg ein Schriftstück hat, das als vertrauliche Eingabe an die Regierung gerichtet ist; doch wird die Denkschrift auf alle Fälle den Wert einer Rechtfertigung des Episkopates vor der Nachwelt haben.“

Hilfeleistungen des Heiligen Stuhls für die Juden

„Für die katholischen Nichtarier wie auch für die Glaubensjuden hat der Heilige Stuhl caritativ getan, was nur in seinen Kräften stand, in seinen wirtschaftlichen und moralischen. Es hat von Seiten der ausführenden Organe Unseres Hilfswerkes eines Höchstmaßes von Geduld und Selbstentäußerung bedurft, um den Erwartungen, man muß schon sagen den Anforderungen der Hilfesuchenden zu entsprechen, wie auch der auftauchenden diplomatischen Schwierigkeiten Herr zu werden. Von den sehr hohen Summen, die Wir in amerikanischer Währung für Übersee-Reisen von Emigranten ausgeworfen haben, wollen Wir nicht sprechen; Wir haben sie gerne gegeben, denn die Menschen waren in Not; Wir haben um Gotteslohn geholfen, und haben gut daran getan, irdischen Dank nicht in Rechnung zu stellen. Immerhin ist dem Heiligen Stuhl auch von jüdischen Zentralen wärmste Anerkennung für sein Rettungswerk ausgesprochen worden.

Zu dem, was im deutschen Machtraum zurzeit gegen die Nichtarier vor sich geht, haben Wir in Unserer Weihnachtsbotschaft ein Wort gesagt. Es war kurz, wurde aber gut verstanden. Daß den nichtarischen oder halbarischen Katholiken, die Kinder der Kirche sind wie alle anderen, jetzt, im Zusammenbruch ihrer äußeren Existenz und in ihrer seelischen Not, Unsere Vaterliebe und Vater-sorge in erhöhtem Maße gilt, brauchen Wir nicht erst zu versi-

chern. So wie die augenblickliche Lage ist, können Wir ihnen leider keine andere wirksame Hilfe zukommen lassen als Unser Gebet. Wir sind aber entschlossen, je nach dem, was die Umstände heischen oder erlauben, von neuem Unsere Stimme für sie zu erheben.“

Die nationalsozialistische Erziehung

„Über die beharrliche Treue der deutschen Katholiken zu ihrem Glauben und ihrer Kirche haben Wir gerade in diesen Tagen wieder sehr Trostvolles gehört. Hinter allem Bedrückenden und Erhebenden der Gegenwart steht für Uns jedoch die eine schwere Zukunftsfrage: Wie soll die katholische Jugend, wie die kommenden Generationen, einmal ganz erfaßt von dem geschlossenen System christentumsfremder Beeinflussung und Erziehung, das durch die Parteiorganisationen ... und die schon bekannten Bestimmungen des zu erwartenden Volksgesetzbuches gebildet wird, wie sollen sie ihren katholischen Glauben unverfälscht bewahren und weitergeben? Wir können Uns vorerst nur trösten mit der Verheißung der Heiligen Schrift: ‚Gott ist treu. Er wird euch nicht über eure Kräfte versuchen lassen, sondern mit der Versuchung auch den guten Ausgang schaffen, daß ihr bestehen könnt‘ (1. Kor. 10, 13).

Als Unterpfand dieses ‚guten Ausgangs‘ erteilen Wir — ... ‚im Zeichen des Kreuzes‘, wie du es in deinem Hirtenwort zum letzten Papstsonntag sagst — dir selbst, ehrwürdiger Bruder, deinen Mitarbeitern im Apostolat und allen deinen Diözesanen in väterlicher Liebe und aus der Fülle des Herzens den erbetenen Apostolischen Segen³⁰⁴.“

³⁰⁴ Der Text dieses Schreibens wurde veröffentlicht in *Documentation catholique* vom 2. Februar 1964. Friedländer hat ihn ebenfalls angeführt. (Zitiert nach Adolph, *Verfälschte Geschichte*, S. 39–47. — Anm. d. Übers.)

Anhang III

Die Hauptargumente der Verteidiger Pius' XII.

Maïmonide (*Bulletin de l'Athénée israélite*, Brüssel, Nr. 2, Juni 1963):

Die Ereignisse waren so, daß bereits 1937 die deutschen Zeitungen schreiben konnten: „Pius XI. war zur Hälfte Jude, Kardinal Pacelli (Pius XII.) ist es ganz.“

Édith Mutz

Dr. Safran, Großrabbiner von Rumänien:

Die Vermittlung des Papstes „rettete die Juden vor dem Unheil zu einem Zeitpunkt, an dem die Deportation der Rumänen bereits beschlossen war“.

Maïmonide, a. a. O.

Am 26. Mai 1955 geleitete Paul Kletzki 94 aus 14 Ländern stammende jüdische Musiker nach Rom, um dort die 9. Symphonie von Beethoven aufzuführen.

„Aus Dankbarkeit für das von seiner Heiligkeit vollbrachte großartige humanitäre Werk zur Rettung einer großen Anzahl von Juden während des Zweiten Weltkrieges.“

Pinhas Lapide, israelischer Konsul in Mailand (zur Zeit Pius' XII.):

„Der Papst persönlich, der Heilige Stuhl, die Nuntien und die gesamte katholische Kirche haben 150 000 bis 400 000 Juden vor dem sicheren Tode gerettet. Als ich in Venedig von Msgr. Roncalli, dem späteren Johannes XXIII., empfangen wurde und ihm die Dankbarkeit meines Landes für sein Handeln zugunsten der Juden in der Zeit, als er noch Nuntius in Istanbul war, zum Ausdruck brachte, unterbrach er mich mehrfach, um mich daran zu erinnern, daß er jedesmal auf ausdrückliche Weisung Pius' XII. gehandelt habe. Mir ist im übrigen schwer begreiflich, daß man Pius XII. jetzt angreift, während man hier in Israel viele Jahre lang Gefallen

darán fand, ihm zu huldigen. Nach der Befreiung Roms gehörte ich einer Abordnung von Soldaten der palästinensischen Brigade an, die vom Papst empfangen wurde und ihm die Dankbarkeit der Jewish Agency, der Spitzenorganisation der Weltbewegung des Zionismus, für das, was er für die Juden getan hatte, übermittelte.“

Pinhas Lapide hebt hervor, daß Frau Golda Meïr, der israelische Außenminister, am Todestag Pius' XII. dem Papst herzlich gedankt habe, „weil er seine Stimme für die Juden erhoben hatte“. „Mit dem Wort ‚Stimme‘“, fährt Pinhas Lapide fort, „meinte Frau Meïr sicherlich die zahlreichen Demarchen des Papstes zugunsten der Juden, und sie sah diese Stimme als weitaus wertvoller als einen öffentlichen Protest an. Eins ist sicher: Zahlreiche Staatsoberhäupter und Kirchenfürsten — selbst von anderen christlichen Kirchen —, die in der Lage waren, dem Judentum mit Wort und Tat zu helfen, haben gegen die ‚Kreuzigung unzähliger Brüder des Herrn‘ weit weniger getan als Pius XII.“

Le Monde, 3. Januar 1964

„Man beklagt sich, daß der Papst nicht spricht. Er kann nicht sprechen; wenn er es täte, würde es noch mehr Unheil bedeuten.“ Unter Anführung dieser Worte, die Pius XII. im Verlauf einer Unterredung mit Pater Paolo Dezza, dem ehemaligen Rektor der Università Gregoriana, äußerte, weist dieser darauf hin, daß der Erzbischof von Krakau, Kardinal Adam Sapieha, und andere polnische Bischöfe den Heiligen Vater wissen ließen, daß es besser sei, die Schreiben die er an sie gerichtet hatte, um die nazistischen Grausamkeiten aufzuzeigen, nicht zu veröffentlichen, und zwar, wie sie sagten, um das Los der Betroffenen nicht zu verschlimmern. Sodann erinnert der Ordensgeistliche daran, daß der Großrabbiner von Rom, Zoll, sich nach der Befreiung der ewigen Stadt aus Dankbarkeit für das, was der Papst für seine Glaubensgenossen getan hatte, taufen ließ. Er hebt hervor, daß Zoll es war, der, nachdem er die Taufe empfangen hatte, Pius XII. ersuchte, den Ausdruck „Verräter“, mit dem die Juden in der Liturgie der Karwoche bezeichnet wurden, zu beseitigen.

Die Zeitungen vom 2. bis 5. Januar 1964

Nach der Befreiung sucht Großrabbiner Ullmann Kardinal Van Roey auf, um ihm für seine persönliche Rettung vor der Deportation und für das zu danken, was er für die holländischen Juden getan hat.

In der Slowakei erreicht der von 1941 an durch den Heiligen Stuhl ausgeübte Druck, „daß die Deportationen der Juden im Sommer 1943 eingestellt werden und damit ein Viertel von ihnen überlebt“.

Der Großrabbiner von Rom, Israel Zoll, ist konvertiert und hat sich aus Dankbarkeit gegenüber Pius XII. nach dessen Vornamen, Eugenio, taufen lassen. „Am 29. September 1945 sah man eine Gruppe von Juden, deren Antlitz von Leid gezeichnet war, den Vatikan betreten: 70 vor den Krematorien Gerettete wollten Pius XII. für sein Verhalten während des Krieges danken.“

Maïmonide, Juni 1963

Robert M. W. Kempner, deutscher Jude und früherer amerikanischer Hauptankläger im Nürnberger Prozeß, gab zu Rolf Hochhuths Drama *Der Stellvertreter* die nachstehenden Erklärungen ab. Er stützt sich dabei sowohl auf amtliche Schriftstücke als auch auf private Unterredungen.

„1. Nur ein schneller militärischer Zusammenbruch des Hitler-Regimes, nicht aber ein durch keine Bataillone gestützter Protest von Pius XII. hätte seinerzeit den noch nicht ermordeten Teil der europäischen Juden vor der Endlösung retten können. Dies wußte der Papst ebenso gut wie Franklin D. Roosevelt und Winston Churchill. Pius XII. mußte zu dieser Überzeugung auf Grund ausgezeichneten Informationen und durch Erfahrungen kommen, von denen nur einige hier mitgeteilt seien:

2. Die bereits 1942 und 1943 von Roosevelt, den Exilregierungen und der Moskauer Erklärung öffentlich angedroht Bestrafung von Judenmördern und anderen Verbrechern blieb völlig ergebnislos. Das Nazi-Regime ließ sich nicht einschüchtern, und seine Funktionäre schrieben, wie wir aus Nürnberg wissen, an den Rand der Bekanntmachung: (1) Fühle mich geehrt; (2) Zu den Akten.

3. Der Papst hatte leider nur entmutigende Erfahrungen mit seinen zahlreichen Protesten wegen der Verfolgung von katholischen Priestern und bestimmten Juden gesammelt. Sie blieben erfolglos, und das Reichssicherheitshauptamt sowie Organe der ‚Justiz‘ ermordeten in Deutschland, Österreich, Polen, Frankreich und anderen besetzten Ländern über 3000 katholische Priester, wie eine jetzt von Frau B. M. Kempner vorbereitete ‚Chronik der Märtyrer-Priester‘ nachweist.

4. Als Hitlers Außenminister Ribbentrop nach Erteilung von zahlreichen verlogenen Antworten auf Interventionen und Proteste des Papstes von einer möglichen öffentlichen Stellungnahme des Vatikans erfuhr, sandte er dem Botschafter beim Vatikan, Ernst von Weizsäcker, die folgende erpresserische Instruktion (Telegramm Nr. 181 vom 24. Januar 1943): , . . . Sollte der Vatikan politisch oder propagandistisch gegen Deutschland Stellung nehmen, so würde es unmißverständlich zum Bewußtsein zu bringen sein, daß sich eine Verschärfung der Beziehungen (zwischen Deutschland und dem Heiligen Stuhl) nicht etwa einseitig zum Nachteil Deutschlands auswirken würde, daß es der Reichsregierung vielmehr weder an wirksamem Propagandamaterial noch auch an der Möglichkeit tatsächlicher Maßnahmen fehlt, um jeden vom Vatikan gegen Deutschland versuchten Schlag entsprechend wirksam zu erwidern . . . ‘

5. Zu den spätestens nach dem Siege Hitlers geplanten Maßnahmen gehörte u. a.: ‚Jeder katholische Staat muß sich seinen eigenen Papst wählen‘; ‚Der Bischof von Münster wird einmal vor die Gewehre kommen³⁰⁵‘; ‚Die christlich-jüdische Pest geht ja wohl jetzt ihrem Ende entgegen‘. Diese und ähnliche Erklärungen Hitlers sind einem Aufsatz von sonst unveröffentlichten Teilen des Alfred Rosenbergschen Tagebuches entnommen (Der Monat, 1949, Heft 10). Rosenberg selbst machte 1943 darauf aufmerksam: ‚Der Vatikan wühlt eifrig weiter.‘

6. Bei dieser Sachlage und dem Vordringen der Alliierten . . . konnte Pius XII. keinen öffentlichen Protest . . . erheben. Es war vielmehr weise, auf dem Weg über die Erzbischöfe durch geeignete

³⁰⁵ Msgr. von Galen, der für seine Opposition gegen das Hitlerregime bekannt war.

regionale Interventionen einzugreifen, wie z. B. in der Slowakei, Ungarn und anderwärts. Er selbst mußte nach außen schweigen und nach innen helfen — wie dies laufend geschah — und auf ein schnelles Vordringen der Alliierten warten. Jedes propagandistische Auftreten wäre nicht nur ‚provozierter Selbstmord‘ gewesen — wie Rosenberg erklärt hatte —, sondern hätte die Ermordung von noch mehr Juden und katholischen Priestern beschleunigt.“

Katholische Nachrichten-Agentur,
Informationsdienst Nr. 22, 30. Mai 1963

Maurice Edelman, Präsident der Englisch-Jüdischen Vereinigung und Abgeordneter der Labour Party:

„London, 21. Januar. — Der Labour-Abgeordnete und Präsident der Englisch-Jüdischen Vereinigung, Maurice Edelman, erklärte heute in einer Rede im Londoner Rat dieser Vereinigung, die Intervention Pius' XII. habe die Rettung von Zehntausenden von Juden während des Krieges ermöglicht. Er gab bekannt, daß der Papst ihn bei Kriegsende empfangen und ihn darauf hingewiesen habe, daß er dem katholischen Klerus insgeheim Weisungen zum Schutz der Juden vor der nationalsozialistischen Verfolgung erteilt habe.“

Gazette de Liège, 23. Januar 1964

Armand Baruch gab in den Vereinigten Staaten eine Broschüre zur Verteidigung des Andenkens Pius' XII. heraus, die ganz besonders durch die große jüdische Vereinigung B'nai B'rith verbreitet wurde.

„Ich breche das Schweigen, weil ich in jenen Monaten, von denen das Stück ‚Der Stellvertreter‘ handelt, Mitglied der Deutschen Botschaft beim Heiligen Stuhl war und weil ich aus meinen Erfahrungen in der zwölfjährigen nationalsozialistischen Periode des Schreckens glaube, etwas zur Beurteilung der römischen Ereignisse beitragen zu können . . .

Die Rolle unserer Vatikanbotschaft war nicht einfach. Hitler in seiner Hysterie war zu jedem Verbrechen fähig. Erwägungen, den Papst gefangenzunehmen, ihm einen Zwangsaufenthalt im ‚Großdeutschen Reich‘ anzuweisen, haben bei ihm vom September 1943 bis zum Juni 1944, also bis zum Einzug der Alliierten in

Rom, immer wieder eine Rolle gespielt. Hätte sich der Papst dieser Aktion widersetzt, so war sogar mit der Möglichkeit zu rechnen, daß er ‚auf der Flucht erschossen‘ würde.

Wir waren der Ansicht, es sei unsere oberste Pflicht, wenigstens dies Verbrechen (die Ermordung des Papstes), das im Namen unseres Volkes begangen worden wäre, zu verhindern. Herr von Weizsäcker mußte an zwei Fronten kämpfen: Er mußte dem Heiligen Stuhl, das heißt dem Papst, den Rat geben, keine unbedachten Aktionen zu unternehmen, das heißt Aktionen, deren letzte und katastrophale Folgen er vielleicht nicht klar erkannte . . .

Und ebenso sehr mußte Weizsäcker die Nazis durch diplomatisch formulierte Berichte davon überzeugen, der Vatikan sei ‚guten‘ Willens. Die zahllosen Einzelaktionen des Vatikans zugunsten der Juden seien so bedeutungslos, daß man sie nicht ernst zu nehmen habe.

Schließlich waren wir, das heißt sämtliche Mitglieder der Deutschen Botschaft beim Vatikan, trotz aller sonstigen Differenzen in der Beurteilung der Lage ohne Ausnahme in einem Punkt einig: Ein flammender Protest Pius' XII. gegen die Judenverfolgungen hätte vermutlich ihn selbst und damit die Kurie in höchste Gefahr gebracht, bestimmt aber zum damaligen Zeitpunkt, nämlich im Herbst 1943, keinem einzigen Juden das Leben gerettet. Hitler, einmal aufgebracht, würde um so schrecklicher reagieren, je mehr Widerstand er spürte . . .³⁰⁶

Albrecht von Kessel,

Mitarbeiter von Weizsäckers

(*Osservatore della Domenica*, 28. Juni 1964)

Es wäre unbillig, nicht noch die beiden Bücher: *Pour ou contre „Le Vicaire“* von Dom Claude Jean-Nesmy (Desclée de Brouwer) und *Pie XII, le Pape outragé* von Alexis Curvers (Robert Laffont) anzuführen, die zwar an dem eigentlichen geschichtlichen Problem vorbeigegangen sind, aber trotzdem zwei beachtliche philosophische Verteidigungsschriften darstellen. Wir weisen hiermit den Leser darauf hin.

³⁰⁶ Ausnahmsweise wurde hier wegen zu starker Abweichungen vom Original nicht die vorliegende deutsche Fassung (in Fritz J. Raddatz, *Summa iniuria* oder *Durfte der Papst schweigen*) verwendet, sondern die franz. Fassung übersetzt. (Anm. d. Übers.)

Anhang IV

Kardinal Merry del Val und der Erste Weltkrieg

Am 27. Juli 1914 erkundigt sich der österreichische Botschaftsrat beim Vatikan, Graf Palffy, bei dem Staatssekretär Pius' X. nach seinen Eindrücken hinsichtlich des Ultimatums an Serbien vom 23. Juli. Bereits am folgenden Tage, dem 28. Juli, gehen Gerüchte um, nach denen der Kardinal „der Hoffnung Ausdruck gegeben (habe), daß die Doppelmonarchie bis zum Letzten gehen würde“, das heißt, bis zum Kriege. Sogleich hielt er in einem Tagebuch die mit Graf Palffy geführte Unterredung für sich selbst und für die Geschichte schriftlich fest.

„(Graf Palffy) zu mir gekommen, um meine Eindrücke über das Ultimatum an Serbien zu erfahren. Ich sagte, es schiene sehr hart. ‚Glauben Eure Eminenz, daß Serbien es annehmen wird?‘ fragte mich der Graf. ‚Ich zweifle sehr daran‘, antwortete ich, ‚vor allem hinsichtlich einiger Punkte³⁰⁷. ‚Alles oder nichts!‘ rief der Graf aus. ‚Doch das bedeutet den Krieg‘, sagte ich. ‚Ja‘, erwiderte der Graf, ‚und ich persönlich hoffe, daß Serbien es nicht annehmen wird.‘ ‚Doch dann besteht die Gefahr eines allgemeinen Weltenbrandes‘, bemerkte ich. ‚Soll die Katastrophe nur kommen, das wird besser sein als in der gegenwärtigen Situation zu verharren‘, sagte der Graf. Ich entgegnete lediglich, daß das mir äußerst schwerwiegend schiene. Es ist wahr, *daß ich nach dem furchtbaren Verbrechen von Sarajewo dem Grafen Palffy sagte, daß Österreich hart bleiben müsse und daß es Anspruch auf feierlichste Genugtu-*

³⁰⁷ Um über die Bedeutung der voraufgehenden Frage und dieser Antwort keinerlei Zweifel bestehen zu lassen, muß hervorgehoben werden, daß das Gespräch am 27. Juli stattfand, daß das Ultimatum an Serbien vom 23. Juli stammt, daß Serbien das Ultimatum mit Ausnahme *eines* Punktes annahm, der eine Unmenge von Einzelpunkten umfaßte, daß die diplomatischen Gespräche zwischen der Doppelmonarchie und Serbien am 27. Juli seitens der ersteren zum Ziel hatten, Serbien zu einem Nachgeben auf der ganzen Linie zu veranlassen, und daß Graf Palffy über den Ausgang eben dieser diplomatischen Gespräche den Kardinal um seine Meinung ersuchte. Bekanntlich führten sie zu keinem Ergebnis: Am folgenden Tag, dem 28. Juli, griff Österreich-Ungarn Serbien an.

ung³⁰⁸ sowie auf die Wahrung seiner Existenz *habe*, aber ich habe niemals die Hoffnung oder die Meinung geäußert, Österreich möge zu den Waffen greifen. Nichts anderes wurde gesagt. Dies sei um der Wahrheit willen festgestellt³⁰⁹.“

Nachstehend der Text des Berichtes, den Graf Palffy am 29. Juli an den österreichisch-ungarischen Außenminister, den Grafen Berchtold, sandte:

„Als ich vor zwei Tagen den Kardinal-Staats-Sekretär besuchte, lenkte er natürlich das Gespräch sofort auf die großen Fragen und Probleme, die heute Europa beschäftigen. Von einer besonderen Milde und Versöhnlichkeit war aber in den Bemerkungen Seiner Eminenz nichts zu fühlen. Die an Serbien gerichtete Note, die er als äußerst scharf bezeichnete, billigte er trotzdem rückhaltlos und gab gleichzeitig indirekt der Hoffnung Ausdruck, daß die Monarchie auch durchhalten werde. Freilich, meinte der Kardinal, sei es schade, daß Serbien nicht schon viel früher ‚klein gemacht‘ worden sei, denn damals wäre dies vielleicht ohne einen so großen Einsatz an unübersehbaren Möglichkeiten durchführbar gewesen wie heute. Diese Äußerung entspricht auch der Denkart des Papstes, denn im Verlauf der letzten Jahre hat Seine Heiligkeit mehrmals das Bedauern geäußert, daß Oesterreich-Ungarn es unterlassen habe, seinen gefährlichen Nachbar an der Donau zu ‚züchtigen‘³¹⁰.“

Der Vergleich dieser beiden Texte zeigt deutlich, welchen Glauben man den Mitteilungen beimessen kann, durch die die Botschafter ihren Regierungen über die Gespräche berichten, die sie mit den berufenen Persönlichkeiten derjenigen führen, bei denen sie akkre-

³⁰⁸ Von uns kursiv, um hervorzuheben, daß es nicht am 27. Juli war, als der Kardinal Österreich riet, „hart zu bleiben“, was seine Zustimmung zum Krieg bedeutet hätte, sondern am 28. Juni. Am 27. Juli fordern seine Worte klar zur Versöhnung auf, der Leser ersieht aus dem Text selbst deutlich, daß daran kein Zweifel besteht.

³⁰⁹ Zitiert nach *Osservatore Romano* v. 23. Mai 1936.

³¹⁰ Graf Sforza, *Mémoires*. (Bericht des Gesandten Grafen Moriz Palffy aus Rom-Vatikan, 29. Juli 1914 Nr. 33. Zitiert nach *Österreich-Ungarns Außenpolitik von der bosnischen Krise 1908 bis zum Kriegsausbruch 1914, Diplomatische Aktenstücke des österreichisch-ungarischen Ministeriums des Äußern*, 8. Bd., ausgew. u. bearb. v. L. Bittner u. a., Wien und Leipzig 1930, S. 894. — Anm. d. Übers.)

ditiert sind — Mitteilungen, die im Falle der gegen Pius XII. erhobenen Anklage das ganze Argument Friedländers ausmachen.

In seinen 1923 veröffentlichten *Mémoires* zitiert Graf Sforza, der vor dem Faschismus italienischer Botschafter in Paris und 1945 italienischer Außenminister war, den Bericht des Grafen Palffy zum Beweis dafür, daß „der Vatikan zumindest zu Anfang mit Befriedigung auf ein Unternehmen [den Krieg] blickte, in dem die Vernichtung Serbiens eine Verminderung des Einflusses Rußlands zur Folge gehabt hätte“, weil nämlich der Vatikan in Rußland „das Haupthindernis für eine Aussöhnung der Ostkirche mit dem Heiligen Stuhl“ sah. Er führt jedoch nicht die Richtigstellung Kardinal Merry del Vals an, die er im übrigen nicht kannte, da sie erst am 23. Mai 1936 veröffentlicht worden war. Dagegen zitiert er ein Telegramm vom 24. Juli 1914, das von dem bayerischen Gesandten beim Vatikan, Baron von Ritter, abgefaßt ist und den Bericht des Grafen Palffy mit folgenden Worten bekräftigt: „Papst billigt scharfes Vorgehen Österreichs gegen Serbien und schätzt im Kriegsfall mit Rußland die russische und französische Armee nicht hoch ein. Kardinalsekretär hofft ebenfalls, daß Österreich diesmal durchhält, und wußte nicht, wann es sonst noch Krieg führen wollte, wenn es nicht einmal eine ausländische Agitation, die zum Morde Thronfolgers geführt hat und außerdem bei jetziger Konstellation Österreichs Existenz gefährdet, entschlossen ist, mit den Waffen zurückzuweisen. Daraus spricht auch die große Angst der Kurie vor dem Panslavismus³¹¹.“

Kardinal Merry del Val lebte noch. Seine Entgegnung lautete: „Die beklemmenden Tage zwischen dem 29. Juni und dem 20. August 1914 haben sich meinem Gedächtnis so eingeprägt, daß ich mich an alles, was ich in meinen Gesprächen, sei es mit Baron von Ritter, sei es mit anderen Diplomaten, sagte, erinnere und auch daran, mit welcher Sorgfalt ich meine Worte abwog. Es ist sehr richtig, daß ich nach dem entsetzlichen Verbrechen von Sarajewo wiederholt erklärte, daß Österreich hart bleiben müsse, daß es vol-

³¹¹ Graf Sforza, *Mémoires*. (Telegramm Ritters Nr. 216 vom 24. Juli 1914. Zitiert nach *Bayerische Dokumente zum Krieausbruch und zum Versailler Schuldspruch*, hg. v. P. Dirr, 3. erw. Aufl., München und Berlin 1925, S. 206. — Anm. d. Übers.)

len Anspruch auf feierlichste Genugtuung und auf wirksame Wahrung seiner Existenz habe. Aber ich habe mich keineswegs der Ausdrücke bedient, die mir in dem Telegramm des Barons von Ritter zugeschrieben werden, noch jemals die Hoffnung geäußert, daß Österreich zu den Waffen greifen würde. Dies stellt eine Deutung und Interpretation dar, der ich in keiner Weise zustimme³¹².“

Pierre Dominique³¹³ und Jacques Nobécourt³¹⁴, denen im Jahre 1964 alle diese Texte bekannt sind, zitieren sie, und beide geben zu, daß sowohl der Bericht des Grafen Palffy als auch das Telegramm des Barons von Ritter verdächtig sind, die Version von Kardinal Merry del Val dagegen nicht, doch bringt sie das nicht in Verlegenheit: Beide legen den Akzent auf den Ausdruck „hart bleiben“ (*tener forte* im Original), wie wenn er am 27. Juli 1914 gesprochen worden wäre und nicht, wie der Kardinal sagt, „nach dem entsetzlichen Verbrechen von Sarajewo“.

Um den Schluß zu ziehen, daß der Vatikan für den Ersten Weltkrieg mitverantwortlich ist.

Doch es ist klar, daß dieser Ausdruck, unter seinem wirklichen Datum eingeordnet, nicht den Sinn hat, den sie ihm geben, und den Vatikan in keiner Weise mitverantwortlich macht.

Wann wird man einmal mit dieser Art von Geschichtsschreibung aufhören?

³¹² *Osservatore Romano* v. 22. Oktober 1923.

³¹³ Dominique, *Le Crapouillot*, April 1964, S. 61.

³¹⁴ Nobécourt, *Le Vicaire*, S. 120 ff.

Anhang V

Das Problem der deutschen Reparationsschulden

So wie die Dinge zur Zeit liegen, ist die Regelung sämtlicher etwaigen Forderungen aller der Länder, die sich durch Deutschland auf Grund des Krieges für geschädigt halten, durch ein am 27. Februar 1953 in London zwischen den ehemaligen Alliierten und Deutschland unterzeichnetes Abkommen bis zum Zeitpunkt der Unterzeichnung des Friedensvertrages mit dem wiedervereinigten Deutschland zurückgestellt worden. Als Gegenleistung dafür hat Westdeutschland sich bereit erklärt, schon jetzt alle aus rassischen, religiösen oder politischen Gründen verfolgten oder materiell geschädigten Personen zu entschädigen. Dies fand seinen Ausdruck in dem sog. *Entschädigungsgesetz* sowie dem *Rückstattungsgesetz*, die beide verschiedentlich durch Ergänzungsgesetze (*Bundesergänzungsgesetze*) präzisiert wurden, insbesondere am 1. Oktober 1953, 29. Juni 1956 und 19. Juli 1957 sowie erst kürzlich am 24. Juni 1964. Man hätte erwarten können, daß Ostdeutschland sich diesen Maßnahmen anschließen würde. Aber nein, durchaus nicht. So macht man von allen Seiten Rechnungen fertig: Die einen, die im Namen geschädigter Staaten aufgestellt werden, sollen, zumindest theoretisch, bei Abschluß des Friedensvertrages vorgelegt werden, von dem man die endgültige Sanktionierung der gegenwärtigen Teilung Deutschlands erhofft, was bedeutet, daß Westdeutschland diese Rechnungen allein bezahlen müssen. Die anderen, im Namen der einzelnen Opfer des Nationalsozialismus ausgestellten Rechnungen können schon jetzt Westdeutschland allein vorgelegt werden.

Unter den erstgenannten Rechnungen wurden bisher lediglich die von Jugoslawien (70 Milliarden Dollar, wie es in *L'Express* vom 20. Februar 1964 heißt) und die von Griechenland (20 Milliarden Dollar) bekanntgegeben. Man darf sicher sein, daß die Rechnung, die Deutschland, ob wiedervereinigt oder nicht, präsentiert werden wird, wenn erst Rußland und seine Satelliten die ihren aufgestellt haben werden, besonders gepfeffert sein wird.

Unter den zweitgenannten Rechnungen erscheinen die Abfindungen für Personenschäden (Tote, Entschädigungsberechtigte, Invalidität usw.) sowie Betrug an Sachwerten (Diebstahl von Vermögenswerten), die den Opfern des Nationalsozialismus zugefügt wurden. Im Anschluß an Verträge, die am 10. September 1952 in Luxemburg zwischen Westdeutschland einerseits und der *Conference on Jewish Material Claims against Germany* und dem Staat Israel andererseits abgeschlossen und die dann durch alle die oben genannten aufeinanderfolgenden Gesetze genauer bestimmt wurden, setzte Westdeutschland schließlich die jedem Opfer des Nationalsozialismus zustehende Entschädigung für Personenschäden auf 5000 DM (1250 Dollar) oder im Todesfall auf 3000 DM (750 Dollar) für jeden seiner Berechtigten fest. Im Laufe des Jahres 1964 sind sämtliche Opfer des Nationalsozialismus, ob Juden oder nicht, auf dieser Grundlage entschädigt worden.

Mit den in den zehn Jahresraten zahlbaren 3 Milliarden DM, die dem Staat Israel durch die Luxemburger Verträge zugestanden wurden und die in der Folge durch verschiedene Verhandlungen (insbesondere jene, die der Eichmann-Prozeß im Jahre 1960/61 unvermeidlich machte) auf 4 Milliarden, zahlbar in fünfzehn Jahresraten, erhöht wurden, hält sich der Staat Israel, der sich zum Erben der 6 Millionen Juden, die von den Nationalsozialisten vernichtet worden sein sollen, einsetzte, für geschädigt: Bei 750 Dollar für jeden von ihnen kommt er selbstverständlich nicht auf seine Rechnung. Daher seine fortwährenden Reklamationen im Sinne einer Erhöhung der ihm zugebilligten Entschädigung. Wenn man seinen Forderungen entspricht . . .

Die *Conference on Jewish Material Claims against Germany* ihrerseits verliert das Problem der Rückerstattung jener Vermögen

³¹⁵ Diesbezüglich klärte uns eine Kontroverse zwischen jüdischen Organisationen, die sich über mehrere Nummern der Zeitung *Le Monde* (11., 19. und 29. März 1964) erstreckte, darüber auf, daß die bis jetzt von Deutschland geleisteten Jahresraten an die *Conference on Jewish Material Claims against Germany* nicht unter die Opfer des Nationalsozialismus aufgeteilt wurden, sondern der Reihe nach unter die jüdischen Mitgliedsorganisationen dieser Stelle (in diesem Jahr sind die jüdischen Organisationen Frankreichs an der Reihe), und zwar, um „zum Wiederaufbau des jüdischen Lebens beizutragen“ (Bau von Synagogen, Einrichtung von Bibliotheken, Subventionierung von

nicht aus den Augen, die man Deutschland als Diebstahl an den Juden der ganzen Welt zur Last legt. Bei ihrer Tagung in Brüssel am 8., 9. und 10. März 1964 hat sie eine Aufstellung der Summen vorgenommen, die Deutschland in dieser Hinsicht den Juden der ganzen Welt rückerstatten soll. *La Terre retrouvée* (1. April 1964) gibt diese Aufstellungen im einzelnen wieder:

Deutsche Juden	2000 Millionen Dollar
Slowakische Juden	140 Millionen Dollar
Polnische Juden	3000 Millionen Dollar
Belgische Juden	618 Millionen Dollar
Rumänische Juden	1000 Millionen Dollar
Tschechoslowakische Juden	650 Millionen Dollar
Ungarische Juden	570 Millionen Dollar
Französische Juden	950 Millionen Dollar
Holländische Juden	450 Millionen Dollar
Griechische Juden	120 Millionen Dollar
Gesamtbetrag	9498 Millionen Dollar
Rund: 10 Milliarden Dollar ³¹⁵ .		

Die allgemeine Endsumme, die man auf Grund dieser bekannten und sehr unvollständigen Angaben erhält, erreicht bereits astronomische Ausmaße: über 100 Milliarden Dollar! Man erschauert bei dem Gedanken, wie diese Summe aussehen wird, wenn einmal jeder seine Rechnung präsentiert hat.

Im Vergleich dazu war, wie ich bereits gesagt habe, das, was durch den Versailler Vertrag von Deutschland gefordert wurde, nur eine Bagatelle.

Der Beweis dafür ist erbracht.

Jugendorganisationen usw.). Auf diese Weise hat nach Aussage des Präsidenten der jüdischen Organisationen Frankreichs (*Le Monde* v. 19. März 1964) Dr. Nahum Goldmann der Präsident der jüdischen Organisation in Amerika, *hundert Millionen Dollar* (!) für seine Organisation erhalten, von der nicht ein einziges Mitglied auch nur den geringsten Schaden seitens Deutschlands erlitten hat. Von Zeit zu Zeit erfährt man auch, daß ein Jude, ohne den geringsten Schaden erlitten zu haben, sich für einen angeblichen Diebstahl entschädigen läßt, der gestützt wird durch . . . eine falsche Zeugenaussage: Auerbach-Skandal, Deutsch-Skandal usw. Ein ungezügelter Gangstertum. Die Herrschaft der Sittenlosigkeit in ihrer schönsten Blüte. Doch was macht das schon: Deutschland zahlt ja — Westdeutschland allein!

Personenverzeichnis

- Adenauer, Konrad 170, 179, 192
Adolph, Walter 30, 33, 37, 91, 225
Albrecht, Dieter 66
Alfaric, Prosper 111
Alfieri, Dino 86, 141, 142
Aristophanes 41
Armstrong, Anne 139 f.
Auerbach 238
- Badoglio 158 f.
Baruch, Armand 230
Bastianini 153 f., 158 f.
Beaverbrook, Lord 72
Beck, Oberst 122, 124
Benedikt XV., Papst 35, 80 f., 85, 104, 106 ff., 113 f., 116, 118, 147
Berchtold, Graf 233
v. Bergen 34, 69 ff., 75, 77, 135, 145 f., 161
Bergmann, Ernst 68
Berning 179
Bertram 65, 177
Billig, Joseph 56
Bittner, L. 233
Blum, Léon 110
v. Bodelschwingh, Friedrich 182 f.
Bonnet, Georges 120, 123, 130 f.
Bouglé 200
Brand, Joël 60 f.
Briand 104, 107 f.
Brossolette, Pierre 211, 213, 215
Brüning, Heinrich 168, 173, 190
Bullitt 131
- Caillaux 104
Calvin 26
Camus, Albert 51 f.
Canaris 123, 206
Chamberlain 73, 123, 127, 148 f.
Charles-Roux, François 80, 130, 149
Chruschtschow 23
Churchill, Winston 13, 29, 73, 84, 88, 228
Cianfarra, Camille 80, 149
Ciano, Graf 135, 140 f., 147, 153, 157, 211, 217
de Cigala, Albin 103
Claudel, Paul 40 f.
Clemenceau 81, 85, 105, 107
Combes, Émile 73, 101, 111, 195
Constantini 75
- Corneille, Pierre 38, 40
Cortesi 133
Curvers, Alexis 52 f., 231
Curzon, Lord 73
- Daninos, Pierre 31
Darnar, Pierre-Laurent 215, 218
Deakin, F. W. 153, 158
Delcassé 101
Deutsch 238
Dezza, Paolo 227
Dibelius, Otto 175
Dirr, P. 234
Döpfner 92
Dominique, Pierre 102, 105 f., 235
Donati, Angelo 34
Dubost 57
Duclos, Paul 74, 80, 86, 116, 135, 140, 148, 150 ff.
- Eden 154
Edelmann, Maurice 230
Eichmann 47, 49, 59 f., 237
Erhard, Ludwig 192
Falconi, Carlo 205, 207 ff.
Faulhaber 65, 116
Feigelson, Ralf 56
Fontana, Riccardo 21
François-Poncet, André 120 ff.
Franz Joseph II., Kaiser 85, 104
Frick 169
Friedländer, Saul 11, 14, 34, 36 f., 43, 45, 57 f., 63 ff., 68 f., 71 ff., 86, 88, 103, 117, 127 ff., 132 f., 135 ff., 142 f., 145 f., 150, 154 f., 161 f., 164, 208, 225
Fummi, Luigi 153 f., 158 f.
- Gafencu, Grigore 123
v. Galen, Graf 68, 75, 187, 229
Gallo, Max 72 f.
Gasparri 213
de Gaulle, Charles 160
Gerstein, Kurt 21, 40, 42 ff., 49 f., 87 f., 103
Gföllner, Johannes 176
Giovannetti, Alberto 74, 77 f., 80, 128, 130 ff.
Godfrey 132
Goebbels, Joseph 65, 175 f.

- Göring, Hermann 122, 125, 156 f., 169, 179
 Goldmann, Nahum 238
 Grass, Günter 32
 Gröber 179
 Grosser, Alfred 63, 86 f., 162
 Guareschi 23
 Guignebert, Charles 111
 Halifax, Lord 123, 132 f., 150
 Heinrich IV., Kaiser 97
 Heller 53
 Herberichs, G. 209
 Herriot 217
 Heuss, Theodor 192
 Himmler, Heinrich 90
 v. Hindenburg, Paul 168, 173, 175
 Hitler, Adolf 13, 15 ff., 21 f., 25 f., 28, 37 f., 54, 58, 61, 68, 71 ff., 81, 83, 86, 108, 113, 120 ff., 130 ff., 135 f., 140, 142 f., 147 f., 150 ff., 157 ff., 162, 167 ff., 174 f., 177 ff., 183 f., 186 ff., 190 f., 193, 206, 215, 217, 229 ff.
 Hochhuth, Rolf 11, 14, 21 f., 27 f., 30 ff., 34, 38 ff., 51 ff., 56, 62 f., 68, 72, 82, 87, 91, 103, 117, 153, 164, 167, 173, 186, 189, 208, 211, 228
 Hudal 152
 Hugo, Victor 27, 40
 Innitzer 119
 Jaray, G.-L. 74
 Jaurès 90
 Jean-Nesmy, Dom Claude 231
 Johannes XXIII., Papst 48, 81, 99, 118, 198 f., 206 f., 226
 Jussen, Wilhelm 84
 Kaas 169 f., 179
 Karl d. Große, Kaiser 98
 Karl I., Kaiser 104
 Karl V., Kaiser 98
 Kastner, Rudolf 59 f.,
 Kempner, B. M. 229
 Kempner, Robert M. W. 56, 228
 Kerrl 177, 184
 Kersten 90
 v. Kessel, Albrecht 231
 Kessel, Joseph 90
 Kleist, Peter 156, 160
 Kletzki, Paul 226
 Kollontai 156
 v. Krug 155
 Latapie, Louis 35
 Lapede, Pinhas 226 f.
 Laval 155
 Lebesque, Morvan 55
 Le Clec'h, Guy 32
 Léger, Alexis 131 f.
 Leiber, Robert 12, 17, 66, 87
 Lemkin, Rafael 59
 Leo XIII., Papst 80, 99 f., 109, 112, 118, 194, 213
 Lewy, Guenter 15 ff., 63
 Lipski 123
 Litwinow 123
 Loriquet, Jean 90 f.,
 Lorulot 111
 Lübke, Heinrich 192
 Luther, Martin 26, 39
 Maccarrone, Michele 66, 80
 Maglione 34, 57 f., 70, 118, 130, 135, 142, 148 f., 151 ff., 158
 Mann, Thomas 51, 55 f., 59
 Marahrens 186
 Marlé 52
 Mauriac, François 51 ff., 177
 Marx, Karl 171
 McKnight, G. 55
 Meir, Golda 227
 Menshausen 69, 75
 Michel, Louise 188
 Molière 40
 v. Moltke 123
 Montefiore 153
 du Moulin, Graf 64 f.
 Mourin 148
 Moyne, Lord 60
 Müller, Hans 181
 Müller, Ludwig 182 f.
 Mussolini, Benito 72 f., 86, 88, 99, 108, 124, 126, 128 ff., 135, 141 ff., 147, 154, 156 ff., 215, 217
 Mussolini, Rachele 157
 Mutz, Edith 226
 Niemöller, Martin 16, 174, 183 ff., 188, 191
 Nitti, Francesco 151
 Nobécourt, Jacques 11, 14, 28 ff., 42 ff., 62 f., 92, 102 f., 105 f., 117, 208, 235
 Orsenigo 25, 42, 61 f., 130, 150
 Osborne, Sir 34, 133, 151 f.
 Paganuzzi 65
 Palffy, Graf 232 ff.

- v. Papen, Franz 72, 168, 170, 179, 206
 v. Parma, Sixtus 104
 Paul VI., Papst 82 ff., 90 f., 118, 154
 Péri, Gabriel 218
 Pétain 53
 Petit, Edouard 98
 Peyrefitte, Roger 163
 Pignatelli di Belmonte 118
 Piscator, Erwin 31, 42, 45, 53
 Pius IX., Papst 98 f., 112, 190, 194
 Pius X., Papst 35, 44, 62, 73, 80 f.,
 85, 100 f., 103 f., 106 ff., 113 f., 116,
 118, 232
 Pius XI., Papst 65 f., 72, 76, 78, 80 f.,
 99, 107, 109, 113 f., 118 f., 137,
 177 f., 181, 213 ff., 217 f., 226
 Pius XII., Papst 11 und ständig
 Poliakov, Léon 47, 49 f., 52, 63
 v. Preysing, Graf 13 f., 37, 43, 180,
 207, 219

 Racine 40
 Raddatz, Fritz J. 231
 Raeder, Erich 185
 Rampolla 85, 213
 Rassinier, Paul 45 f., 60, 172
 Renner, Karl 119
 v. Ribbentrop, Joachim 24 f., 61, 65,
 70 f., 123, 126, 130, 149, 156, 160 f.,
 229
 Richter, Hans Werner 32
 Riegner 57
 Riquet 89 f.
 v. Ritter 234 f.
 Roosevelt, Franklin D. 29, 36, 46, 57,
 69, 84, 88, 122, 124 ff., 131, 137,
 139, 144 f., 156, 228
 Rosenberg, Alfred 68, 229 f.
 Rothfels, Hans 49
 Roure, Rémy 90
 Russo, Domenico 150 ff.

 Sabille, Jacques 90
 Safran 226
 Sapieha, Adam 227
 Sartre, Jean-Paul 55
 Senatra, Edoardo 62
 Sforza, Graf 233 f.

 Shakespeare 40
 Shirer, William L. 16, 123, 126, 171,
 173 f., 180, 182, 184, 186 f.
 Solages 116
 Suhard 45, 52
 Schellenberg, Walter 152
 Schiller, Friedrich 40
 v. Schleicher 168
 Schleier 154 f., 161
 Schmidtke, Friedrich 68
 Schreiber, Christian 175
 Schultz 65
 Schweitzer, Albert 51, 53 ff., 62
 Stahel 152
 Stalin, Josef 29, 127, 156, 196
 v. Steengracht 25 f.

 Taylor, Myron 36, 57 f., 61, 137, 140,
 144
 Thorez, Maurice 217
 Tilea 123
 Tiso 120
 Tisserant 44 f., 207
 Tittmann, Harold 36, 46, 58, 69

 Ullmann 228

 del Val, Merry 103 f., 213, 232, 234 f.
 Valeri, Valerio 130 f., 155
 Van Roey 228
 Venturi, Tacchi 129, 141
 Viktor Emanuel II., König 97, 194
 Viktor Emanuel III., König 141

 Weißberg, Alex 59 ff.
 v. Weizsäcker 25, 69 ff., 77, 79, 86, 150,
 154, 159, 161, 229, 231
 Welles, Sumner 128
 Wilhelm II., Kaiser 104
 Wilson 105
 Winter 43, 46
 Wuestenberg, B. 88

 Zabkar, J. 88
 Zand, Nicole 32
 Zoellner 184, 186
 Zoll, Israel 227 f.
 Zweig, Stefan 55

Literaturverzeichnis

- Acta Apostolicae Sedis, Bonne Presse, Paris
Actes et documents du Saint-Siège relatifs à la seconde guerre mondiale, Libreria Editrice Vaticana
Actes de Pie XII, Documentation Catholique, Paris
Adolph, Walter: Verfälschte Geschichte, Antwort an Rolf Hochhuth, Morus, Berlin 1963
Albrecht, Dieter: Der Notenwechsel zwischen dem Hl. Stuhl und der deutschen Reichsregierung, Matthias-Grünwald, Mainz 1965
Alfieri, Dino: Deux Dictateurs face à face, Cheval Ailé, Genf 1948
Armstrong, Anne: Bedingungslose Kapitulation, die teuerste Fehlentscheidung der Neuzeit, Molden, Wien 1965
franz.: Capitulation sans conditions, Presses de la Cité, Paris 1964

Bastianini, Giuseppe: Uomini, cose, fatti, Milano 1946
Bayerische Dokumente zum Kriegeausbruch und zum Versailler Schuldspruch, herausg. von P. Dirr, 3., erw. Aufl., München 1925
Blum, Léon: A l'Echelle humaine, Gallimard, Paris 1948
deutsch: Blick auf die Menschheit, Rowohlt, Hamburg
Bonnet, Georges: Le Quai d'Orsay sous trois Républiques, Fayard, Paris 1964
Bouglé, Celestin: Psychologie des foules, Paris 1921
Brand, Joël: Un Million de Juifs contre 10 000 camions, du Seuil, Paris 1957

Charles-Roux, François: Huit ans au Vatican 1932—1940, Flammarion, Paris 1947
Churchill, Winston: Great Contemporaries, London 1939
—: Mémoires, Plon, Paris 1948
Cianfarra, Camille: La Guerre et le Vatican, Portulan, Paris 1946
de Cigala, Albin: Pie X, Fleurus, Paris 1927
Corneille, Pierre: Le Cid, Classiques Garnier, Paris
Curvers, Alexis: Pie XII, le Pape outragé, Robert Laffont, Paris 1964

Daninos, Pierre: Snobissimo, Hachette, Paris 1963
deutsch: Snobissimo oder die Kunst, sich in Szene zu setzen, Ullstein, Darmstadt 1966
Deakin, F. W.: Die brutale Freundschaft, Kiepenheuer und Witsch, Köln 1964
franz.: L'Axe brisé, Stock, Paris 1964
Dominique, Pierre: Histoire des Papes, Crapouillot, Paris 1964
Duclos, Paul: Le Vatican et la Seconde Guerre mondiale, Pedone, Paris 1955

Falconi, Carlo: Le Silence de Pie XII, du Rocher, Paris 1965
François-Poncet, André: Von Versailles bis Potsdam, Mainz 1949
franz.: De Versailles à Potsdam, Flammarion, Paris 1948
Friedländer, Saul: Pius XII. und das Dritte Reich, Rowohlt, Hamburg 1965
franz.: Pie XII et le III^e Reich, du Seuil, Paris 1964

Gallo, Max: L'Italie de Mussolini, Perrin, Paris 1965
Giovannetti, Alberto: Der Vatikan und der Krieg, Bachem, Köln 1961
franz.: L'Action du Vatican pour la paix, Fleurus, Paris 1958

- Herberichs, G.: *Théorie de la Paix selon Pie XII*, Pedone, Paris 1965
- Hochhuth, Rolf: *Der Stellvertreter*, Rowohlt, Hamburg 1963
- Hugo, Victor: *Les Misérables*, Classiques Garnier, Paris
- Jaray, G.-L.: *Messages de guerre*, Fleurus, Paris 1946
- Jean-Nesmy, Dom Claude: *Pour ou contre „Le Vicaire“*, Desclée de Brouwer, Paris 1964
- Kastner, Rudolf: *Bericht über Eichmanns Menschenhandel in Ungarn*, Kindler, München 1961
- Katholische Kirche und Nationalsozialismus, *Dokumente 1930–1935*, herausg. von Hans Müller, Nymphenburger, München 1963
- Kempner, Robert: *Eichmann und Komplizen*, Europa, Stuttgart o. J.
- Kessel, Joseph: *Les Mains du miracle*, Gallimard, Paris 1954
- Kleist, Peter: *Zwischen Hitler und Stalin 1939–1945*, Athenäum, Bonn 1950
franz.: *Entre Hitler et Staline*, Plon, Paris 1950
- Lewy, Guenter: *The Catholic Church and Nazi Germany*, McGraw-Hill, New York 1964
deutsch: *Die Katholische Kirche und das Dritte Reich*, Piper, München 1965
- Maccarrone, Michele: *Il Nationalsocialismo e la Santa Sede*, Rom 1947
- McKnight, G.: *Le D^r Schweitzer*, Stock, Paris 1964
- Mourin, —: *Les Tentatives de Paix dans la Seconde Guerre mondiale*, Payot, Paris 1949
- Mussolini, Rachele: *Ma Vie avec le Duce*, Cheval Ailé, Genf 1948
- Niemöller, Martin: *Vom U-Boot zur Kanzel*, Warneck, Berlin 1934
- Nobécourt, Jacques: *„Le Vicaire“ et l'histoire*, du Seuil, Paris 1964
- Österreich-Ungarns Außenpolitik von der bosnischen Krise 1908 bis zum Kriegsausbruch 1914, *Diplomatische Aktenstücke des österreichisch-ungarischen Ministeriums des Äußeren*, 8. Bd., ausg. und bearb. von L. Bittner u. a., Wien 1930
- Der Papst an die Deutschen, Pius XII. als Apostolischer Nuntius und als Papst in seinen deutschsprachigen Reden und Sendschreiben von 1917 bis 1956, herausg. von B. Wuestenberg und J. Zabkar, Scheffler, Frankfurt 1957
- Petit, Édouard: *L'Italie*, Aristide Quillet, 1929
- Peyrefitte, Roger: *Les Ambassades*, Flammarion, Paris 1957
—: *La Fin des Ambassades*, Flammarion, Paris 1958
- Pius XII., *Vorkämpfer des Friedens*, Berlin 1951
- Pius XII., *Reden und Enzykliken*, herausg. von P. Wilhelm Jussen SJ, Hamburg 1946
- Poliakov, Léon: *L'Arche*, Calmann-Lévy, Paris 1964
—: *La Terre retrouvée*, Calmann-Lévy, Paris 1960
—: *Le Procès de Jérusalem*, Calmann-Lévy, Paris 1963
—: *Le Bréviaire de la haine*, Calmann-Lévy, Paris 1951
- Der Prozeß gegen die Hauptkriegsverbrecher vor dem Internationalen Militärgerichtshof, *Amtlicher Text in deutscher Sprache*, 42 Bände, Nürnberg 1947–1949
franz.: *Compte rendu des débats de Nuremberg*
amerik.: *I. M. T., Nazi Conspiracy and Aggression* (Ergänzungsband B)
- Raddatz, Fritz J.: *Summa iniuria oder Durfte der Papst schweigen?*, Rowohlt, Hamburg 1963

- Rassinier, Paul: Das Drama der Juden Europas, Pfeiffer, Hannover 1965
 franz.: Le Drame des Juifs européens, Sept Couleurs, Paris 1964
 —: Zum Fall Eichmann: Was ist Wahrheit? oder Die unbelehrbaren Sieger,
 Druffel, Leoni 1963
 franz.: Le véritable Procès Eichmann ou les Vainqueurs incorrigibles,
 Sept Couleurs, Paris 1962
 —: Die Lüge des Odysseus, Priester, Wiesbaden 1959 und Damm, München
 1964
 franz.: Le Mensonge d'Ulysse, Librairie française, Paris 1950
- Sartre, Jean-Paul: Les Mots, Gallimard, Paris 1964
 deutsch: Die Wörter, Rowohlt, Hamburg 1965
- Schellenberg, Walter: Memoiren, Politik und Wirtschaft, Köln 1959
 franz.: Le Chef du Contre-espionnage nazi parle . . . , Julliard, Paris 1957
- Sforza, Carlo Comte: Mémoires, Plon, Paris 1921
- Shirer, William L.: Aufstieg und Fall des Dritten Reiches,
 Kiepenheuer und Witsch, Köln 1961
 franz.: Le III^e Reich, des origines à la chute, Stock, Paris 1961
- del Val, Merry Pie X, Souvenirs et impressions, Fleurus, Paris 1927
- Vierteljahreshefte für Zeitgeschichte im Auftrag des Institutes für Zeitgeschichte
 München herausg. von Hans Rothfels und Theodor Eschenburg, Deutsche Ver-
 lags-Anstalt Stuttgart, 1. Jg. 1953
- Weißberg, Alex: Die Geschichte von Joel Brand, Kiepenheuer und Witsch,
 Köln 1957
- Zweig, Stefan: Die Welt von gestern, Erinnerungen eines Europäers,
 S. Fischer, Frankfurt 1962
 franz.: Le Monde d'hier, Albin Michel, Paris 1939

Bemerkungen zur elektronischen Fassung (Mai 2001)

Bei der Bearbeitung wurden folgende Korrekturen und Ergänzungen vorgenommen :

- S. 7 : *(Die Reihenfolge der beiden Zeilen Anhang IV und Anhang V im Inhaltsverzeichnis wurde richtiggestellt.)*
- S. 41 : Bühnensstück — Bühnenstück
- S. 80 : Cianfara — Cianfarra
- S. 108 : Koppliment — Kompliment
- S. 112 : Guiseppe — Giuseppe
- S. 116 : (Fußnote 162) : Weihnachtbotschaft — Weihnachtsbotschaft
- S. 125 : einnnahm — einnahm
- S. 141 : (Fußnotenverweis) : gewähren möge²²¹ — gewähren möge²²²
- S. 153 : (Fußnote 246) : Daekin — Deakin
- S. 156 : (Fußnote 251) : *(Gegenüber dem französischen Original fehlte dieser Satz) :*
Eine letzte Bemerkung: dieser Schleier mußte besonders qualifiziert sein, um die Telegramme der deutschen Botschaft in Paris zu verfassen: er kennt nicht einmal den genauen Namen des Informanten, den er nennt, der nicht „von Krug“ ist, sondern „Krug von Nidda“!
- S. 158 : Guiseppe — Giuseppe
- S. 163 : Krigführenden — Kriegführenden
- S. 178 : (Fußnote 275) : *(Fehlende Seitenangabe) :* 211—218.
- S. 178 : (Fußnote 276) : *(Fehlende Seitenangabe) :* 226—231
- S. 182 : Deligierten — Delegierten
- S. 188 : typischter — typischster
- S. 193 : (Fußnote 292) : *Réveillez-~~vouz~~! — Réveillez-vous!*
- S. 205 : bewunderswertes — bewundernswertes
- S. 224 : was nur **nur** in seinen Kräften stand — was nur in seinen Kräften stand
- S. 239 : Cianfara — Cianfarra
- S. 239 : Darnar, Pierre-**Laurant** — Darnar, Pierre-Laurent
- S. 241 : Piux IX. — Pius IX.
- S. 241 : Rousso — Russo
- S. 242 : Cianfara — Cianfarra
- S. 242 : Guiseppe — Giuseppe
- S. 243 : Hochhut — Hochhuth
- S. 243 : Petit, Edouard: L'Italie, **Aritide** Quillet, 1929 — Aristide

Bemerkung : Auf Seite 21 beginnt die Fußnotennumerierung bei 2!